



BX  
3033  
D7Fe

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
36 933 749

Fabre

The University of Chicago  
Libraries



# THE SETTLING OF THE ENGLISH BENEDICTINES AT DOUAI

AS SEEN CHIEFLY THROUGH UNPUBLISHED DOCUMENTS OF  
THE VATICAN ARCHIVES (1607-1611)

By FRÉDÉRIC FABRE

SOME years ago, when working at the Vatican Archives in search of materials for a history of the English College at Douai during its earlier period, I came across a series of letters which contained passages relating to the English Benedictines and their recently established convent in the same town. Most of these letters form part of the correspondence which passed between Cardinal Borghese, "Cardinal Nephew" and Secretary of State to Paul V, and the papal Nuncios at Brussels in the course of the years 1607-1611. Five of the letters belong to the nunciature of Decio Caraffa, Archbishop of Damascus (July 1606 to June 1607); the others, by far the more numerous, belong to that of his successor Guido Bentivoglio, Archbishop of Rhodes, who arrived as Nuncio at Brussels in August 1607 and remained till 1615, when he was transferred to Paris.

In the finding of these documents I was greatly helped by the inventories of the *fonds* Borghese and Barberini published by the Abbé A. Pasture,<sup>1</sup> also by a manuscript catalogue of documents in the Vatican very kindly lent me by Dr Guilday; and last but not least, I am particularly indebted to Dr H. J. Elias,<sup>2</sup> one of the most

<sup>1</sup> "Inventaire du Fonds Borghese au point de vue de l'histoire des Pays Bas" par l'Abbé Pasture, in the *Bulletin de la Com<sup>on</sup> Royale d'Histoire*, vol. 79, pp. 1-217, Bruxelles, 1910.—"Inventaire de la Bibliothèque Barberini" par l'Abbé Pasture, in the *Bulletin de l'Institut historique Belge de Rome*, 3<sup>e</sup> fasc., Bruxelles et Paris, 1924.

<sup>2</sup> He is the author of *Kerk en Staat in de zuidelijke Nederlanden onder de regeering der aartshertogen Albrecht en Isabella (1598-1621)*, Louvain, 1931. I also owe special and respectful thanks to Monseigneur Eugène Tisserant, the Pro-Prefect of the Vatican Library, for kindly authorising the transcription of the documents used in this article.

recent authorities on the history of the Low Countries under the Archdukes Albert and Isabella, who at a later date most generously placed at my disposal his private collection of transcripts.

Some references to this correspondence, and some extracts from it, have been given already by Dr Guilday;<sup>1</sup> but most of the English Benedictine matter remains unpublished. It struck me therefore that an article summarising this fresh evidence would be of historical interest, especially to English Benedictines, and most of all to the community of St Gregory's at Downside, which carries on the original convent at Douai. And as there seemed to be no more appropriate place for such an article than the DOWNSIDE REVIEW, I offered it to the Editor, who in his great benevolence allowed it to pass muster and gave it hospitality.

\* \* \*

The new documents will enable students to follow in detail the course of a certain episode in the early history of St Gregory's which hitherto has been insufficiently known. What is referred to is the controversy which arose over the English Benedictine foundation at Douai, and the struggle the monks had in order to maintain their convent there. A mere glance at the new evidence (see the Appendix to this article) will convince the reader that here we are given first-hand information of a private character. We are let into the confidence of the higher authorities to whom was entrusted the welfare of the English Catholics in the Low Countries. We witness the exchange of views between Brussels and Rome. We are enabled to follow the ups and downs in the fortunes of each party as the causes of each are more or less forcibly advocated by representatives at Brussels or at Rome, or backed by influential Cardinals in the Curia. We become

<sup>1</sup> In his well-known book *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent*, 1558-1795, London and New York, 1914. Chap. vii, pp. 222-223, and Appendix, pp. 436-440.



History  
Rev.

## The English Benedictines at Douai 95

acquainted also with the standpoint of the Nuncios, who in their official position are equally friendly to the Benedictines and their opponents, who make their investigations on the spot, and are particularly well placed to grasp the situation. And all along we cannot but admire the untiring zeal, patience, and insight displayed by Guido Bentivoglio; whilst on the other hand, as the different elements of the problem are revealed one by one, the prudent policy adopted by Rome, tactful and deliberate, results in a verdict remarkably free from bias.

Before coming to the documents themselves it is necessary, or desirable, to state as briefly as possible how the situation arose to which the documents have reference.

On the 5th of December 1602, a few English Benedictines who had entered the Order in the monasteries of Italy and Spain were granted faculty by Pope Clement VIII to take part in the English Mission together with the secular clergy and the fathers of the Society of Jesus. It is necessary to say, in order to understand better the difficulties which the new-comers were to find at Douai in 1607, that the English Benedictines had not re-entered on their ancestral patrimony without great opposition, especially from Fr Persons. This great pioneer, of extraordinary activity and ardour, who played such a prominent part in most of the political schemes of the time for bringing about a restoration of Catholicism in England, had won the confidence of Philip II of Spain since the end of 1582. Also since 1597, after his successful allaying of the stirs in the English College at Rome, he had become the chief adviser of the Holy See for English affairs and had practically in his hands the control of the English Mission.<sup>1</sup> Already in 1594 he had succeeded for a while in getting a petition of the Cassinese Chapter rejected. At that time the Chapter of the Cassinese

<sup>1</sup> See the letter, dated February 2nd 1598, of Fr Henry Tichbourne, Fr Persons' right-hand man in Rome, explaining the situation to Fr Thomas Darbyshire, a Jesuit in Paris; Dom. Eliz. CCLVII, 28.

Congregation had petitioned the Holy See to grant its English monks leave to work in their native country. It is noteworthy that the main charge brought against the Benedictines, even before 1601, that of collusion with the English Government,<sup>1</sup> was renewed in 1607 by Fr Persons acting in conjunction with Dr Worthington, President of the English College at Douai, as appears from a memorial by the former,<sup>2</sup> and especially from the correspondence of the Nuncio Guido Bentivoglio.

As soon as the faculty to take part in the English Mission had been granted by Clement VIII, the decree was acted upon at once by neophytes of the younger generation, eager to follow in the wake of St Augustine and his monks, who in the days of old had converted heathen England to the Catholic Faith. Three of these from Spain and two from Italy reached England early in 1603, at about the time when Elizabeth died and was succeeded by James I. Those from Italy were Frs Thomas Preston and Anselm Beech (familiarily known as "Don Anselmo"); those from Spain, who arrived a little before the others, were Frs Augustine Bradshaw, John Roberts (the martyr, now beatified) and Joseph Prater. The superior of those from Italy, who were of the Cassinese Congregation of St Justina of Padua, was Fr Preston. The superior of those from Spain, who were of the Valladolid or Spanish Congregation, was Fr Bradshaw. About September of the year 1605, shortly before the Gunpowder Plot, Fr Bradshaw left England. He had previously gone to Brussels, at the instance of the Spanish Ambassador, Don Juan de Tassis, to negotiate

<sup>1</sup> See Dom Anselm Beech's "Scriptum pro informatione dominorum cardinalium . . . in causa benedictinorum Anglorum 1608," in Dodd-Tierney vol. IV, pp. ccviii-ccxiii, especially the answers to *objectio prima* and *objectio septima*. Also Fr Leander's "Responsio pro Monachis Anglis," *Downside Review*, May 1928; especially pp. 147-148 and pp. 153-155.

<sup>2</sup> Reproduced by T. G. Law in the *English Historical Review*, 1889, vol. IV, pp. 731-3, from a manuscript in the British Museum, Add. MSS. 21203 f.14. See especially No. 7 in these "Capita querelarum."

with the Archduke Albert (ruler of the Spanish Netherlands) as to Thomas Lord Arundell's taking the command of the English Regiment in Flanders. Having concluded this business he returned to England, and Arundell then consented to accept the command on condition that Fr Bradshaw should accompany him as his chaplain. After their arrival at the camp, which was then at Ostend,<sup>1</sup> Fr Bradshaw was appointed Chaplain-Major to the force by the Archbishop of Mechlin. But in May 1606 the English Regiment was disbanded owing to intervention on the part of the English Jesuits.<sup>2</sup> Fr Bradshaw being thus cashiered,<sup>3</sup> directed his efforts to the realisation of a plan which he had probably had in mind for some time, namely the establishment somewhere in the Low Countries of a priory for the English monks of his Congregation. He appears to have tried first at Louvain,<sup>4</sup> but failed. He then secured from the Archduke Albert a letter of recommendation to Philip de Caverel, Abbot of St Vaast at Arras (28th September 1606), and a similar letter to the same prelate from the Nuncio Decio Caraffa. The text of the Nuncio's letter is not preserved, but it is mentioned by Weldon in his *Chronological Notes* and much earlier by Caverel himself.<sup>5</sup> The result was that the pious and munificent Abbot, the most wealthy in those parts,<sup>6</sup> at once took the English monks under his

<sup>1</sup> *Downside Review*, March 1897, p. 30.

<sup>2</sup> For details see Fr Leander's "Responsio," op. cit. pp. 154-5. Also a letter of Fr Bradshaw to Nicholas Fitzherbert at Rome, 16 March 1607. Dom Hugh Connolly has printed this letter in *Some Dates and Documents* (1930) pp. 62-3, from a copy in the Archives of Monte Cassino. We give in the Appendix another copy of the same, but more correct and dated a little later, March 26th, from the Vatican Archives, Borghese III, 45c, fol. 7 (antico) or 8 (moderno).

<sup>3</sup> *Dates and Documents* p. 8.

<sup>4</sup> So says Mr Bishop, *Downside Review* xxv, p. 57 (Easter 1906).

<sup>5</sup> *Dates and Documents* pp. 10 and 13.

<sup>6</sup> "L'Abbate di San Vedasto . . . dell'ordine di S. Benedetto, il piu ricco di detto ordine, e di tutti gli altri Abbati di questi parti" (Bentivoglio to Cardinal Borghese, from Cambrai, 5th October 1611: Archiv. Vat., Bibl. Barber. 6805, f. 152).



care. In his letter to Caverel the Archduke had expressed the fear that it would be difficult to find a house for them in which they could live "conventualiter," and he had suggested to the Abbot that they might be distributed by ones and twos, to the number of eleven or twelve, among the different Benedictine monasteries of the neighbourhood. Still, there is no doubt, from the events that followed, that the monks had fixed their minds on Douai, which had the advantage of a University<sup>1</sup> and was already, with Louvain, the greatest centre of English Catholicism in the Low Countries, "a little Rome of its own far from the capital of Catholic Christianity."<sup>2</sup> And so, according to Weldon, we find them first obtaining a dormitory in Anchin College, the third college in point of time affiliated to the University of Douai, after the ancient Collège du Roi<sup>3</sup> and the English secular College. It was a foundation of the Benedictine Abbot of Anchin, Dom Jean Lentaillieur who, chiefly at the instance of Vendeville, doctor of both laws and first professor of the University, had handed over the College to the Fathers of the Society, who were put in charge of the teaching.<sup>4</sup> At the time when the English Benedictines found a shelter there it must have been pretty spacious, as in 1573 it consisted of four large buildings, which by the end of

<sup>1</sup> Solemnly installed on October 5th 1562.

<sup>2</sup> O. Meyer, *England and the Catholic Church under Elizabeth*, translated from the German by the Rev. J. R. McKee, London 1916, p. 98. "No town in Europe, save the Eternal City, can be so interesting to an English Catholic," writes Dom Boniface MacKinlay, O.S.B., in his paper "The City of our Martyrs," *Dublin Review* 1884, vol. xi p. 149. Father Theodard Pouppart in the preface to his *Victoires de la Milice Chrestienne*, Douai, 1665, extols in lyrical strain the numerous English communities which made of Douai an "invincible bastion de l'Eglise."

<sup>3</sup> In the Catholic Encyclopedia vol. v, article on Douai, the order of foundation of the colleges is a little arbitrary. Anchin College was inaugurated on Thursday, October 20th 1568 and the courses began on October. 24th (Buzelin, *Annales Gallo-Flandriæ*, Duaci, 1624, xi pp. 539-540). The English College had been started a few days earlier, on Michaelmas day 1568.

<sup>4</sup> Archives de Douai, BB2 fol. 214<sup>vo</sup>.

the seventeenth century had increased to fourteen.<sup>1</sup> Its spaciousness made it possible for many English students to be received there.<sup>2</sup> And in fact in the first years of

<sup>1</sup> G. Cardon, *La Fondation de l'Université de Douai*, Paris, 1892, p.450.

<sup>2</sup> From an unpublished account of Douai College of the end of 1575, it appears that there were at Douai 230 English exiles. And after the grant, obtained chiefly through the Jesuits, of the Papal pension in April of the same year, students flocked to the College in such numbers "ut jam binis et ternis ædibus contineri non possint omnes alumni hujus seminarii."

In the Douay Diary under date 14th December 1575 we read that the two younger brothers of a nobleman, Robert Throgmorton, were put, one in the English College and the other, who had arrived a little later, at Anchin College—"in Aquicinctensi Collegio apud Patres Societatis locato." From January to 9th February 1576 the hired buildings of the English seculars must have been roomy enough, as four students were received there from Anchin College. But henceforth, for a month and a half, there was another exodus of five students from Allen's foundation to Anchin College: among them John Lowe the future martyr, who from England kept up with François de Bar, Prior of Anchin Abbey, an interesting correspondence about the persecution (*Bibliothèque de Douai. Manuscrit de François de Bar, No. 813 fol. 389*). In March 1576, side by side with two scholars who leave for Anchin, we see Mr. Brown and Mr Kemp, both of noble birth, finding accommodation in the town, "maxime ut numerosa illa multitudo qua nimium propter angustias gravamur discessu suo nos levarent." Conversely, from April 1576 to January 1577, thirteen left Anchin for the English College, thus no doubt filling up voids caused by the fear of the troubles in the Low Countries.

During all these years there was close intercourse between the two Colleges, whose superiors worked together in the greatest harmony and concord. From the same report above mentioned we learn of Allen's students that "singulis diebus Dominicis ac festis confessi patribus Societatis Jesu communicant . . . et prælectiones theologicas, casus conscientiarum et disputationes in amplissimo Jesuitarum Collegio licet multas et frequentes audiunt omnes, et si quid ab auditoribus publice agendum sit, agunt juxta numeri sui proportionem *plusquam alii omnes*."

After the return from Reims the English College acquired other buildings of their own, higher up and close to St James' Church, on which site they remained till the French Revolution. Although we do not know the exact date of the removal, the Douai Archives mention them as living in their new residence in 1596. The building had to be repaired and enlarged. They began to accommodate a room for a chapel only on 22nd June 1600 (*Third Douay Diary, C.R.S. x p. 24*). The new chapel which they built was not begun till 1603, when the foundation stone was laid on 22nd February (*ibid.* p. 47).

The reader is requested to excuse this long note, out of proportion to the present article. But the relation of Anchin College to Allen's foundation is, we think, very little known. And the distinction of the two successive abodes of the English College at Douai (which is connected with the present account) will not perhaps seem superfluous when we read from the pen of the Editor of the Seventh Douay Diary (*C.R.S. xxviii p. 103*), referring to an old engraving of Douai College dated 1627: "It is difficult to say whether . . . the other three sides of the quadrangle were not part of the original buildings occupied by Allen."

Allen's College, which were passed in a hired tenement quite near by (on the opposite side of the rue des Connins), many of them had found accommodation in the foundation of Dom Lentaillé, which must have afforded greater comfort and to which some of them would be moved when it was necessary to relieve the overcrowded English College.

It is more than probable that the simple dormitory in a college conducted by the Fathers of the Society of Jesus did not permit of the few forlorn Benedictines leading the regular life of a community. But a little later, on 12th May 1607, we find them established in a house rented from the Trinitarians at Douai,<sup>1</sup> with licence also of the Ordinary, Jean Richardot, Bishop of Arras, as Fr Bradshaw twice declares in letters written by him on 26th (or 16th) March and April-May of the same year.<sup>2</sup> Thus all the conditions then required for a canonical foundation had been complied with—a point to be borne in mind when considering the events of the next two years. As Dom Hugh Connolly fittingly puts it,<sup>3</sup> "The name of St Gregory's was not applied to our convent at Douay during the first four years of its existence, that is to say, while our Fathers occupied the house rented from the Trinitarian Fathers. . . . The name in fact was reserved for the permanent and stately building to be erected by Abbot Caverel. But when Caverel's house was once built and occupied, the name was commonly used to describe the house from its first foundation. . . . A change of premises, of course,

<sup>1</sup> The convent itself of the Trinitarians was in the paroisse St Jacques, a little to the S.E. of the English College and close to the ramparts. Buzelin, who made part of his humanities at Douai, thus describes it in his *Gallo-Flandria* (Duaci, 1625) I, p. 163 D: "Neque deest Sanctissimæ Trinitatis nomine conspicuis Fratribus cœnobium ad muros urbis loco patenti, ac ideo minùs commodo. Templum ejus nunc capacius quam antea: ædes numero Religiosorum angustæ, cum illic ad studia quidam alantur, et Provincialis minister ut plurimùm sedem habeat."

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix, no. III; and Guilday op. cit. p. 438.

<sup>3</sup> *Dates and Documents*, Prefatory Note, p. 5.

makes no breach of continuity." And now in this humble residence close to the Trinitarians,<sup>1</sup> the Divine Office was performed and the Rule of St Benedict observed. In the words of Fr Bradshaw, written to the Benedictine Cardinal de Givry on 18th August 1607: "itaque adhuc contenti vivimus paupere prioratu, in quo tamen pro ratione conventus nostri ("so far as our limited numbers permit") opus Dei complemus et regulam nostram ad literam (quod aiunt) observamus." He had just said: "Nondum obtinuimus facultatem monasterium erigendi, quæ sola facultas nobis deest, et si adesset a Principe (the Archduke), habemus reliqua omnia parata;" which words call for another preliminary observation, viz. that when in documents subsequent to May 1607 mention is made of permission, licence, to *found* or *erect* a monastery at Douai, what is now in question is (at least from the point of view of the monks) the new and permanent house which Abbot Caverel, as early as the first half of 1607, had offered to build.

## I.

The arrival of the Benedictines, despite their small number at the outset, was calculated to raise apprehensions in the minds of Dr Worthington, President of the English College, of his staff, and also of the Jesuit Fathers under whose strong influence, if not dependence, the College had now come. On the death of Dr Barret, Allen's successor as head of Douai College, Dr Thomas

<sup>1</sup> The *Liber Graduum Conventus S. Gregorii* says "in domo conductitia quæ tum spectabat ad Patres Trinitarios" (*Dates and Documents* p. 20). The spy Lewis Owen, who appears to have seen the house, says: "Whereupon immediately hee [i.e. Fr John Roberts, to whom he attributes the foundation] hired a convenient house, neere St James Church in Doway and accommodated a lower roome for a Chappell to say Masse, and gathered ten or twelve other English monks unto him, whereof he was the Prior" (*Running Register*, London, 1626, p. 90). So too Fr Thomas Woodhope, writing circa 1646: "The first beginning was at the Trinitarians neere St James parish Church in Doway" (*Dates and Documents* p. 59, and now also in *C.R.S.* xxxiii (1933), p. 243).

Worthington was appointed President (1599), through the influence of Fr Persons, although the members of the house had petitioned for a President of their own nomination, Dr Matthew Kellison,<sup>1</sup> who succeeded in 1613. "Curavit (Personius) . . . ut Barreto, seminarii Duaceni præsidi defuncto substitueretur Thomas Worthingtonus, homo Societati conjunctissimus," says Fr Henry More, S.J., in his *Historia Provinciæ Anglicanæ Societatis Jesu* (St Omer, 1660, p. 248). It is noteworthy that the new President had placed himself under a vow of obedience to Fr Persons.<sup>2</sup>

That the opposition to the Benedictines did not come from Dr Worthington alone is made manifest by a letter which has survived of Fr Persons to him, concerning one of the many memorials addressed to Rome against the monks,<sup>3</sup> and by a letter of Persons to the Pope.<sup>4</sup> Also, from the clause in the General Instruction given to Guido Bentivoglio (1607), in which mention is made of the new "dispareri" between the English Benedictines and Jesuits at Douai, from the letters of Cardinal Borghese to Bentivoglio, from those of "Don Anselmo," the mouthpiece of the Benedictines at the Court of Rome, and from the *Regulæ* themselves which put an end to the contest (10th December 1608), it is clear that the English Jesuits were active in the case. But some of the causes of their alarm can be well understood: they feared a repetition of what had taken place at Valladolid, where

<sup>1</sup> Dr Richard Smith to Paul V (1613 ?): "Nam rejecto Doctore Kellisono, viro dignissimo, quem Alumni in Presidem elegerant, opere P. Parsoni traditum est cuidam Jesuitæ in voto," etc. (Guilday, op cit. p. 433).

<sup>2</sup> See the previous note; also Dodd-Tierney, vol. V p. 5. It may not be out of place to mention here the judgment passed on Dr Worthington by a modern historian of Douai: "Bei aller Hochachtung und Anerkennung, welche der Eifer Worthingtons verdiente, war er doch zu weit gegangen, wenn er sich P. Parsons gegenüber durch ein förmliches Gelübte zum Gehorsam verband" (A. Bellesheim, *Wilhelm Cardinal Allen und die englischen Seminare auf dem Festlande*: Mainz, 1885, p. 214).

<sup>3</sup> Printed in the *Catholic Miscellany*, vol. II p. 206.

<sup>4</sup> Of 6th July 1608: see Appendix to the second part of this article under date.

by 1607 some 40 or more students had left the College to become monks in the monasteries of Spain. The danger of a similar exodus at Douai must have been rendered more likely by the steady deterioration of the English College under Dr Worthington's rule and the discontent arising out of it among the students. Far from providing the necessary check, the state of the College must have quickened the attraction felt by many students to an Order so bound up with the history of the Church in England. The Benedictines had the glamour of the past—and had they not been the great missionaries of Europe?

Indeed, the advent of Dr Worthington as President had brought about a great change in the College. By degrees the old professors had been removed; after the disturbances in the English College at Rome a very strict set of rules had been drawn up in 1599, and these rules had been introduced at Douai, as in the other English Colleges. The students felt that restrictions had been carried to an extreme, and found some of them but little congenial to English manners and temperament. They lamented the golden age of the beginnings, when Allen ruled his College by the force of his own lovable nature, without the need of written regulations.<sup>1</sup> Nor did the studies compare favourably with the high standard to which they had been kept up in the flourishing days of Allen's more liberal government. In the words of the

<sup>1</sup> An unpublished document of 1606 allows us an insight into the grievances of the students at Douai: "Cum enim juvenes nostri ex Anglia religionis et conscientiae solum zelo ducti . . . et relictis omnibus Christum sequuntur, in pectoribus suis regulam, disciplinam et frenum secum afferunt, omni quacumque saeveritate fortiolem, quod ipsum Cardinalis Alanus probe considerans in Collegio suo nullas unquam regulas praescripsit praeter exempla seniorum et conscientias aliorum. Unde factum est, ut catervatim ex Anglia eo confuerent omnes, ubi disciplina ista nova terri, nobilissimi et doctissimi juvenes divertuntur. Neque hoc dicimus, quasi debitam disciplinam in Collegiorum nostrorum regimine negligendam putamus, sed quia servilem hunc et illiberalem gubernandi modum, qui servitus potius est, quam disciplina, nostris nullo modo convenire judicamus."

Editor of the Third Douay Diary, Dr Worthington "was accused of replacing the former professors with young men taken straight from the schools, and of acting under the direction of Father Persons in thus dismissing the older professors. The charge was also brought that he presented students for ordination and sent them on the mission, after an altogether insufficient preparation of a few months' study, which in many cases barely exceeded one year; and that he embarrassed the English mission by sending this constant stream of incompetent missionaries."<sup>1</sup> That such was the real state of affairs is corroborated by a letter of the Archpriest Birkhead, of 17th September 1609,<sup>2</sup> to Dr Worthington, in which stress is laid on the condition of many priests in England "who are driven to wonderfull miserie." Also many of them, he complained, "are but verie younge men, and judged to be welearned [*sic*: "not welearned"?], and not sufficient to discharge there office, as some of the laitie, who are marvelous observative, have signified to me. Hereupon many do wish that some good order were taken to keep them longer at there bookes." It must be said that those who made their studies at Douai at that time were not the pick of the English students. Among the innovations introduced by Dr Worthington was an ordinance directing all the most promising youths to be transferred to other seminaries, in Rome or Spain, and reserving only the less gifted ones to the establishment at Douai. This ordinance was once a month read out publicly to the students.<sup>3</sup> The memory of these sad times was to be a lasting one, and the opprobrious nickname of "Douay Dunces" was still to be recalled more

<sup>1</sup> *Cath. Rec. Soc.* X, p. xvii.

<sup>2</sup> Domestic James I, xxxvi 8. The Calendar wrongly bears the date 7th Sept. 1608.

<sup>3</sup> "Quibus verbis illi, qui remanent in Collegio, notari se quodammodo sentiunt, tanquam stupidiores; quæ cum, singulis mensibus, ipsis publicè perlegantur, ruborem illis incutiunt, simul et indignationem excitant" (Visitation of Douay College in 1612: 10, 11, quoted by Tierney, V, p. 37).

than a century later, by Dr Witham,<sup>1</sup> one of the most remarkable successors of Allen at Douai. Thus the ferment of dissatisfaction spread; and with a deepened sense of their own degradation the dejected students turned their eyes to the Benedictine revival among their own nation.<sup>2</sup>

Already in June 1604 a group of six students had left Douai College for Spain with the intention of becoming Benedictines there. They were followed on 1st September by two more. Then on 6th September another left, one Ralph Green, who a few days before had caused some disturbance and persuaded a number of students to sign a petition for the upholding of certain customary liberties which they feared were about to be restricted. On 25th August, 1605, two more departed with the same object, one of them being the afterwards celebrated William (in religion Rudesind) Barlow. In 1606, though we meet with cases of either unfit or refractory students, we do not hear of any leaving to become Benedictines.

It is evident that the news of what had taken place at Valladolid in 1599 and 1603 had early reached Douai, and was producing its effects. The apprehensions that this would cause in the minds of Dr Worthington and Fr Persons can easily be realised. The crisis became acute in the autumn of 1606, when it was learnt that the English Benedictines proposed to found a priory in the town. We have seen that this house was actually opened on 12th May 1607. The coming of English monks to Douai was the signal for a fresh movement towards the

<sup>1</sup> President 1715-1738. "Nondum obliti sumus in antiquioribus Collegii Duaceni Regulis, formati a Patre Pers(oni)o et arte Jesuitarum, insertam fuisse ad nostrum dedecus ut præstantioris ingenii juvenes ad alia Collegia sub regimine Patrum mitterentur, et reliqui inferioris ingenii et capacitatis remanerent Duaci, unde infame dictum of Douay dunces" (*Cath. Rec. Soc.* XXVIII—Seventh Douay Diary—p. xiii).

<sup>2</sup> For an estimate of the motives which induced the future Martyr John Southworth to leave the English College and join the Benedictines (at St Gregory's, Douai), see Fr Purdie's *Life* of that Martyr, London, 1930, p. 46.



Order on the part of students of the College. The Third Douay Diary, under date 25th May 1607, records that on that and the previous days a consultation was held by the superiors of the College on the case of seven students who, nearly two months before, had signified to the President their desire of becoming Benedictines. They had been allowed to remain in the College in the meanwhile in order to give Fr Bradshaw, the superior of the English monks, time to make arrangements for their reception. But as he had been unable to do so, they now asked to be kept on in the College indefinitely until a suitable occasion should offer. To this the authorities, not unreasonably, refused to consent, and decreed the dismissal of all seven students.

Dr Worthington's worst fears were thus fully justified. But before these events, and before the Benedictines had installed themselves conventually in their new priory, he had taken steps to meet the danger. And here begins the struggle, which was to last for two years, over the Benedictine house at Douai; and here our new documents come in to throw light on events that have hitherto remained obscure. The first in date of these documents is a letter from the Nuncio Decio Caraffa to Cardinal Borghese, written from Brussels on 20th January 1607. From this we learn that Dr Worthington had just paid a visit to the Nuncio and placed in his hands a memorial against the English Benedictines, which was to be sent to the Cardinal that the Pope might be informed of its contents.<sup>1</sup> The memorial referred to is not forthcoming, though it was perhaps seen by Mr Edmund Bishop, who seems to quote some words from it.<sup>2</sup> This visit of the President to the Nuncio is not mentioned in the Third Douay Diary. It was probably of too private a nature to be related in this mostly official record. The

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix, no. I.

<sup>2</sup> In the *Downside Review* for March 1897, p. 32. See also *Dates and Documents*, p. 11.

Diary does, however, mention a previous visit, of about 19th September 1606, when he went to Brussels to greet Caraffa after his first arrival as Nuncio. Had he then imparted his fears to him? If so, the Nuncio had taken no measures to restrict the Benedictines. Clearly it was the visit of 20th January, or a little before, that officially opened the proceedings. In his letter referred to, Decio Caraffa, after mentioning that he forwards Dr Worthington's memorial, thus proceeds: "I have deemed it expedient to take steps that the design of the English Benedictine Fathers be not put into effect until His Holiness ordains what is to be done in the matter, and I shall await instructions."<sup>1</sup>

Very likely it was on the occasion of this visit to the Nuncio that Dr Worthington waited also on the Archduke, to lay his complaints before him; for on 22nd January 1607 Thomas Edmondes, English envoy at Brussels, writes to Salisbury: "The President of the English College at Douay, called Dr Worthington (who is wholly the Jesuits' creature), hath been lately to sue unto the Archduke that one White [i.e. Fr Bradshaw], a Benedictine friar, may not be suffered to proceed to the erecting of a College of the order at Douay, as he has in hand to do; the said President pretending to desire the restraint thereof, for that the said new Company would be an occasion to overthrow the other College under his Charge, which is of ancients foundation; but the special reason is that the Jesuits will not allow of any Seminaries but such as they may absolutely govern, and to have the means to choose out of them the best spirits to draw unto their Society; and therefore Baldwin<sup>2</sup> did interest him-

<sup>1</sup> It seems very clear, however, that the Nuncio took no such steps before receiving Cardinal Borghese's reply to his letter.

<sup>2</sup> Fr William Baldwin, S.J., is thus described in a long report of a spy (Dom. Eliz. Addenda xxxiv, 40 fol. 118) which has been partly reproduced by Taunton in his *History of the Jesuits* (London, 1901, p. 239), but not always *literatim*: "At Bruxilles Baldwyne who doth manibus pedibusque conari for Parsons and for the K. of Spayne and is the supream heade of

self and join with the President in the presenting of that suit."<sup>1</sup>

In a letter of 26th (or 16th<sup>2</sup>) March 1607 written by Fr Bradshaw to Nicholas Fitzherbert in Rome, alluding to Dr Worthington's petition to the Pope ("supplica al Papa") he affirms that the Fathers of the Society had bitterly complained of the monks to the Archduke, but without success; also to the Bishop of Arras, Jean Richardot, and to the Benedictine Abbots of those parts who provided for the maintenance of the English monks.

Although we are not acquainted with the exact contents of Dr Worthington's memorial, which we know was to be followed by many others, yet we are not left to guess at the nature of the main accusations. From the above-mentioned letter of Fr Bradshaw, from Fr Leander Jones's *Responsio*, written in September 1607, from the memorial of Fr Persons printed by T. G. Law in the *English Historical Review* (vol. IV, pp. 731-33), but chiefly from subsequent reports of the Nuncio Bentivoglio giving a calm retrospective account of the quarrel after it had subsided, it is evident the main charge was a very serious one: that of secret alliance with the persecuting English government. A report had even been circulated that Fr Bradshaw had had his appointment as Chaplain-Major from the Council of England; and the Nuncio Frangipani, Caraffa's predecessor, was supposed to have informed Fr Baldwin, S.J., that Arundell had told him this. The

all Englishmen in fflaunders. . . . Contynuall letters passe betweene him and Parsons, the one for the affaires of Rome, thother for fflaunders and their opynions in all matters and causes and what they thinke most fitt to be done therein." (Taunton has "who doth mainly work for Parsons and for the King of Spain.") See also the part he played in the affair of Dr Gifford, April-May 1598, in R. Lechat, S.J., *Les Réfugiés Anglais dans les Pays-Bas Espagnols* (Louvain and Paris, 1914) p. 193.

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Guilday, op. cit. p. 232 (note), from *P.R.O., Flanders Correspondence*, vol. VIII, p. 239<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> This letter is printed in *Dates and Documents*, p. 62, from a copy at Monte Cassino, in which the date is 16th March. There is a more accurate copy in the Fondo Borghese, which has 26th March.

assertion was denied both by Frangipani and Arundell in letters written by them in June 1608.<sup>1</sup> On the whole, the efforts of the Benedictines to establish themselves at Douai were represented as an underhand attempt to ruin the English College, the chief support of the Catholic religion in England ("con varii inganni et con machine occulte gettar a terra quell'edificio, che è principal sostegno della religion cattolica in Inghilterra").<sup>2</sup> And these suspicions, which in the end proved to be groundless, must have found all the more credit in high circles inasmuch as the part played by the Appellants in 1602, and their partial success in Rome after they had found strong support at the hands of de Béthune and Cardinal d'Ossat, the representatives of the French King, were still fresh in men's minds. Had not Bluet, Mush and his companions obtained through the English government the means of carrying on their appeal at Rome? Had they not tried to obtain at Rome not only the cancellation of the appointment of the Archpriest but also the recall of the Jesuits from England?<sup>3</sup> And after what had passed between Bluet and the Privy Council, might not this unnatural alliance with the State be resumed out of a common motive of hostility to the Fathers of the Society? In his general Relation concerning England, penned on 31st January 1609 when a final settlement of the whole affair had been reached, Bentivoglio puts the case in a nutshell: "The Benedictines had been suspected of having more recourse than they ought to the King's Ministers; and owing to the tricks of the same Ministers other suspicions of a more secret correspondence came to be entertained against them. Accordingly there were many who doubted whether the efforts made by the

<sup>1</sup> See Fr Leander's "Responsio pro Monachis Anglis," in the *Downside Review* vol. XLVI (May 1928), p. 153; and *Dates and Documents* p. 39.

<sup>2</sup> Bentivoglio to Card. Bianchetti, 10th January, 1609. Guilday, *op. cit.* p. 439.

<sup>3</sup> A. Meyer, *op. cit.* p. 450.

Benedictines during the last few years to establish themselves at Douai—under pretext of having better commodity for studies and more convenient access to the mission in England—were not really directed to other and no very good ends. Especially it was feared that the thing would result in an injury to the English Seminary founded in the University there ; that is to say, that the Benedictines would secretly entice away many of the students from it, and by their influence do great harm by sowing seeds of discord between the Jesuits and the seminarists. Nor were the wiles of our enemies wholly in vain. Owing to these suspicions the Seminary opposed the foundation of the Benedictines, and other quarrels of all sorts arose, till at last it was realised that the Benedictine foundation at Douai had none but good objects in view ; and articles of concord having been framed by His Holiness and ordered to be inviolably observed by the parties, animosities have been allayed and all dissensions practically put an end to.”<sup>1</sup>

To return to Caraffa’s letter of 20th January 1607 and the memorial enclosed with it. In his reply, dated 17th February, Cardinal Borghese says that the Roman supporters of the English College of Douai apprehend grave disorders if the Benedictines are allowed to form a “seminary” in the same place, as they are setting about to do. “So, after reflection on the (Dr Worthington’s) memorial, it is judged advisable, for the avoiding of jealousies and discords, that the Benedictines should be counselled (“di persuadere alli detti Benedettini”) that it would be much better to erect the said seminary in another place, at a distance from Douai, than in the town itself ; as they would thus have more time to devote to their pious exercises and more opportunity of promoting the service of God by their good example.” “Your Lordship (he continues) will take the proper

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix to the second part of this article under date 31 Jan. 1609.

steps in this matter, but in such a way as to give no occasion for complaints ; and you should inform yourself minutely of everything that seems necessary in order to perform this service to our Lord with the more seemliness (" quiete ") and edification. The manner in which the business is to be handled is left to your own prudence."<sup>1</sup>

It must have been immediately on receipt of this letter that Decio Caraffa wrote, on 8th March 1607, to Fr Bradshaw requesting him to come to Brussels, because he had now received (from Rome) the instructions which he was to impart to him, and he thought it better to do this by word of mouth than by letter. The text of this letter is preserved in one written a week or two later by Fr Bradshaw to Mr Nicholas Fitzherbert in Rome, which has been referred to above (p. 108 and note). Most of it, written no doubt originally in English, is extant only in an Italian translation ; but the Nuncio's letter is quoted in Latin, and so also is part of the substance of Fr Bradshaw's reply to him. " Those friends of ours [he means Dr Worthington and others], seeing that we were already established at Douai with good licence both of the Archduke and of the Bishop of the diocese, procured that the Nuncio should write to us in this manner. I wrote back to him excusing myself that I was unable to visit him at present, both on account of the many things I had to do by order of my superiors, and also for want of money. Igitur precatus sum, ut me excusatum haberet, donec mihi suppeteret pecuniarum facultas et veniendi opportunitas. Et si quid erat quod mihi commendatum voluit, per suas litteras a fideli amico dandas significare dignaretur. Id perinde mihi fore, ac si præsenti in os diceretur." In the earlier part of the letter he shows that information had reached the monks of the steps that were being taken against them by their opponents at Rome, " where, as there is no one of ours<sup>2</sup> to confute their calumnies, they

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix, no. II.

<sup>2</sup> i.e., no English monastic procurator or agent. D. Anselm Beech, who later undertook this charge, did not arrive in Rome till near the end of November 1607.

think to prevail. For it is said for certain here that the President of the English (College) in Douai, at the instigation of the Jesuit Fathers of his nation, have sent a petition to the Pope, signed by many, not only for the removing of us out of Douai, but even for the cancelling of our mission to England." He then details some of the charges brought against the monks: they are factious people; they refuse to be guided by the Fathers of the Society; they have been sent, and are maintained over here, by the King of England, only to oppose the Jesuits and ruin the Seminaries.

## II.

We can well understand that Fr Bradshaw was in no hurry to receive the Nuncio's message; he could guess the nature of it, and he wished to gain time at this critical moment. However, he must have visited Caraffa early in June 1607, if not before. From a letter of Fr Bradshaw quoted by Mr Bishop, and written in June, it appears that the Nuncio told him on that occasion that he sent for him "to counsel him to leave Douay, for that the Jesuits and the President (saith the Nuncio) will never let you be quiet."<sup>1</sup>

There is in the Fondo Borghese at the Vatican, in a dossier which seems to be part of the papers belonging to the nunciature of Decio Caraffa, a letter or memorial from the Prior and community of the Benedictines at Douai to Paul V.<sup>2</sup> In this letter the monks

<sup>1</sup> *Downside Review*, March 1897, p. 32.

<sup>2</sup> Printed by Guilday, op. cit. p. 437-8. There is another copy among the Silos Papers (xii 153): see *Dates and Documents* p. 23, note 2. Dr Guilday gives the date as 9th June, 1607; but on inspection the Vatican copy is found to be undated (as is also that at Silos): on the dorse, after the address "Sanct<sup>mo</sup> Dño N<sup>ro</sup> Paulo PP. Quinto, is written: "Al Malacrida (?) che ne tratti con l'Arcivescovo di Rhodi e li dica che procuri di tenerli in pace"; and then again below: "A li 9 di Giugno 1607 si diede copia à l'Arcivescovo di Rodi destinato Nuntio in Fiandra." So that 9 June is the date on which a copy was given to Bentivoglio in Rome just before his departure (or sent to him just after); and the letter must have been written a good month earlier, April-May. As we shall see, the Nuncio appears to have received a (second ?) copy on his arrival at Brussels in August.

complain to the Pope of the wrongs they have suffered at the hands of the Jesuits and the President, and appeal for redress and help. If this letter was sent to Rome through the Nuncio, its despatch must have been one of the last acts of Caraffa before he left Flanders. It would seem, in any case, that the Benedictines finally prevailed upon the Nuncio to grant them some further time in which to represent their case. Nor could he with strict impartiality refuse them a chance of being heard in Rome, having himself originally commended them to Abbot Caverel, and a few months later forwarded Dr Worthington's petition against them—and this evidently without first hearing them in their own defence. Seeing the reluctance of the monks to leave Douai and the difficulty of "persuading" them thereto (as his instructions were), and being on the eve of his own departure, it seems likely enough that he would be inclined to grant them a temporary respite and leave the final settlement to his successor.

Meanwhile the Benedictines, in face of the impending danger, would not be taken unawares, and they made timely provision for a stand. Besides sending the collective letter of petition to the Pope, Fr Bradshaw had looked for protectors in Rome. At the end of his letter to Fitzherbert (of March 1607), already mentioned, he begs the latter to procure, either from the Pope himself or from some Cardinal, letters in favour of the monks to the Nuncio and to Abbot Caverel. Only a few days before writing that letter, he had addressed himself, on 13th March, to Cardinal de Givry, the only Benedictine Cardinal at the time, who in April 1604 had succeeded Cardinal d'Ossat as Vice-Protector of French affairs at the Court of Rome.<sup>1</sup> And it appears from his letter that

<sup>1</sup> In July 1605 he became "Protecteur des affaires du roi" at Rome, succeeding in this office to Cardinal de Joyeuse (MS.219 of the Town Library at Metz, foll. 38-9). The Prior of the abbey of St Germain des



the Cardinal had already heard, "through our friends," of the activities and needs of the English Benedictines, and had shown a lively interest in them. He therefore humbly begs the Cardinal to come to their assistance in the Curia, especially by vindicating their innocence and sincerity to the Pope. Of these "friends" of the English monks in Rome—the plural may have no special significance—we certainly know the chief, and perhaps the only one of note. Nicholas Fitzherbert had linked himself to the Benedictines by ties of long-standing friendship. A former pupil of Allen at Douai College, and his secretary when the President of the College (then at Rheims) was raised to the purple, he had been from the first, like his eminent patron, a great favourer of the English monks. Father Augustine Baker in his *Treatise of the English Benedictine Mission* mentions him as very likely having with Owen Lewis, after Allen's death, taken an early part in the long series of attempts which led to the granting of faculty to the Benedictines to take part in the English mission. He was held in high esteem by Fr Bradshaw, who had been in correspondence with him as early as January 1606.<sup>1</sup> In August 1607, when there was again question of appointing a bishop for England, Fr Bradshaw named him, though he was a layman, as one of those whom he and his brethren considered worthy of the mitre.<sup>2</sup> At his death, in November 1612, he bequeathed all his possessions to the Procurator of the

Prés, near Paris, thus ended a letter to him dated 10th Jan. 1606: "Valeat vestra Serenitas, inter tot Benedictinos sola purpurata, pro cuius incolumitate non desinimus preces ad Deum fundere" (*ibid.* fol. 43<sup>v</sup>). Fr Bradshaw's letter to de Givry is printed in the *Revue Bénédictine* for July 1930, p. 254-5.

<sup>1</sup> A letter of 21 Jan. is cited (from the Westminster Archives VIII, 99) by D. Bede Camm, *A Benedictine Martyr in England*, p. 164, note 2, London, 1897.

<sup>2</sup> Dodd-Tierney V, pp. xx-xxvii. The letter is to Fitzherbert himself, and was written in answer to the latter's request for his opinion. At the end he states that the next week he will be at Brussels: no doubt to see the new Nuncio, Bentivoglio.

Cassinese Congregation.<sup>1</sup> In a letter to Cardinal de Givry, of 10th June 1607, Fr Bradshaw makes it clear that it was Fitzherbert who was the intermediary between the English monks and the Cardinal in Rome; and from the same letter it appears that the Cardinal had already very warmly espoused their cause.<sup>2</sup>

In taking the English Benedictines under his protection, Cardinal de Givry was pursuing the policy of Henry IV of France, and treading in the footsteps of his predecessors Cardinal d'Ossat and de Béthune. The Abbé R. Couzard in his book *Une Ambassade à Rome sous Henri IV* (Paris, 1900), partly based on unpublished documents in the Château of Sully-sur-Loire, has shown forcibly how deliberately and successfully a French party was reconstructed in the Court of Rome between September 1601 and June 1605. Owing to its rise, favoured more and more by Pope Clement VIII and an increasing number of Cardinals, the yoke of Spanish domination in the Curia was shaken off. It may seem strange at first sight that the recovery of French representation in the Sacred College should prove beneficial to the English Benedictines, since by far the greater number of them were of

<sup>1</sup> The account of Nicholas Fitzherbert in the *Dict. of Nat. Biography*, XIX pp. 171-2, does not mention the part attributed to him by Fr Baker in obtaining faculty for the English Benedictines to take part in the English mission; nor does it allude to the unfavourable account of him given to the Nuncio Bentivoglio on 14th May 1611 by Toby Matthew, a new convert and son of the Archbishop of York: he was, it was stated, a most bitter enemy of the Jesuits, constantly disparaging them in his talk with Catholics, and even heretics coming to Rome (Vat. Archiv., Bibl. Barber. vol. 6804. Also Nunziatura di Fiandra, vol. 137A, fol. 218). Nicholas is not to be confused with his first cousin Thomas Fitzherbert, who was devoted to Fr Persons and afterwards became a Jesuit. We shall have to speak of him later on.

<sup>2</sup> "Nicolaus Fiherberti, singularis amicus noster ordinisque nostri summus amator, in omnibus literis quas ad nos mittit honorificam pietatis tuæ mentionem facit . . . quantoque animi zelo ac affectu R.D.T. de nobis quærit, causam nostram suscipit, consilium auxiliumque auctoritatis et prudentiæ tuæ nobis humaniter pollicetur et præstat. . . humiliter obsecrantes ut . . . omnibus in rebus defendas ac protegas, speciatim in illis causis quas idem . . . amicus noster Nicolaus . . . communicabit" (*Rev. Bénédictine*, Oct. 1930, p. 343).

Spanish profession. And indeed when Dom Anselm Beech, a monk of the Cassinese Congregation, came to Rome (as we shall see) to plead the cause of his brethren, some of his adversaries objected against him that "this cause," if it existed at all, was that of the "Spanish" monks. It was even contended that he had left the Italians to take sides with the Spaniards—an argument well calculated to discredit him in the eyes of the French party.<sup>1</sup> But looking at the matter more closely, it is plain that the thrust could not really go home. The Jesuits, his opposers, were even more closely identified with Spain than the English monks professed in that country; and Cardinal de Givry, himself a Benedictine, knew that these monks had no political aims whatever. In this Cardinal of their Order the English Benedictines found a friend who had now won such general esteem in Rome that even whilst supporting the policy of his King he appears to have stood high above parties and factions. From the first he enjoyed the confidence of Clement VIII and the respect of the Roman Court at large, and this on account of his amiability and integrity.<sup>2</sup> And even if his correspondence had not been preserved by one Husson l'Ecossais, a royal councillor at the baillage de Verdun, who copied it from the original letters, the words "Pontifici Maximo jucundissimus" engraved on his mausoleum<sup>3</sup> would be a lasting testimony to the continuation of his credit with Paul V. Having at heart the redress of abuses and disorders in the Church, all his life he

<sup>1</sup> "Ansam arripiunt (adversarii) ut fautoribus nostris qui in hac curia Gallis magis quam Hispanis studere videntur, suadeant me defecisse ad Hispanos ab Italis: hanc causam nullorum monachorum esse nisi Hispanorum." D. Anselm's letter to Cardinal F. Borromeo, of 28th March 1609 (Milan S.P. p. 614 f. See *Dates and Documents* pp. 35-36).

<sup>2</sup> R. Couzard (*op. cit.* p. 279), basing himself on a letter of the French Ambassador de Béthune to Villeroi, of 15th June 1604 (Arch. de Sully), says of de Givry: "Il n'avait ni la finesse insinuante de d'Ossat, ni l'autorité de Joyeuse: mais il possédait la confiance du Pape, et en quelques jours 'sa grande bonté et son autorité reconnue' lui avaient acquis à la cour romaine toutes les sympathies."

<sup>3</sup> *Gallia Christiana*, XIII, 801.

busied himself with the reform of monasteries. In 1606 he succeeds Cardinal Hierome Rusticucci as Protector of the Order of Cîteaux. In 1607 he is chosen Protector of the Benedictine Congregation of Bursfeld in Germany. Speaking of the same year 1607, Husson l'Écossais remarks that not only do the German, French and Flemish Benedictines resort to him for help, but he extends his charity also to the English exiles, who inform him of their needs on the Continent and of the state of religion in England.<sup>1</sup> His activity in favour of the Jesuits in France is also conspicuous: as early as 1604 he is directed by the French King to draw the Pope's attention to the flourishing state of the Society newly re-established in France.<sup>2</sup> In November 1607 we see him recommending the Fathers to the Pope on the occasion of their general meeting,<sup>3</sup> and trying to obtain the nomination of an "assistant" of the Order in France, as had been done in Spain, Italy and elsewhere.<sup>4</sup> Early in 1604, from a letter of thanks in which Cardinal Bellarmine assures him of his gratitude and devotion to the French King, we gather that the two Cardinals were on the best of terms;<sup>5</sup> and from the letter of Dom Anselm Beech, which will be quoted later, we learn that in the course of 1608 he had proposed these two, a Benedictine and a Jesuit, as sole judges in the cause between the English monks and the Fathers of the Society in Rome, "quorum arbitrio lis omnis componeretur."<sup>6</sup> Not only did foreign princes seek the services of this French Cardinal, but whenever they sent representatives to the Court of Rome these were directed to visit him in their name. For instance, on the accession of Paul V, when these envoys come to lay their masters' congratulations at the feet of the new

<sup>1</sup> MS. 219 of the Metz Town Library, fol. 150.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* fol. 10v.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* fol. 106.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* fol. 91v.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* fol. 18v.

<sup>6</sup> Milan S.P. 614 f. (the print there has "Tivry" by error for "Givry"). See also *Dates and Documents*, p. 36.

Pontiff, they do not fail to visit Cardinal de Givry and present their commendatory letters. Some of these letters for the year 1605 have been preserved, namely from the Dukes of Mantua, Parma, Urbino, Modena, from Count Fuentes, Governor of Milan, the Republics of Genoa, Bologna, Lucca, and the Magistrates of Ferrara.<sup>1</sup>

But still more significant of the power that de Givry might wield in favour of the English monks are two letters, one from the Archdukes Albert and Isabella, the other from Philip III of Spain himself. In the former of these, written from Brussels on 14th of April, 1604, the Archdukes—who style themselves “your good cousins Albert and Isabella”—inform the Cardinal that they have sent a new Agent, no less a person than their Councillor and Grand Chaplain, Don Pedro de Toledo, to reside in Rome in the place of Maître Jean Richardot, who has lately been appointed Bishop of Arras. They renew their thanks for the help and favour so liberally bestowed on the latter, as touching the interests of their dominions, in Rome; they inform de Givry that Don Pedro has been ordered to visit him, and hope that the Cardinal will extend to this successor of Richardot the benefit of his friendly protection and great experience in affairs. The recent appointment of Jean Richardot to the see of Arras was in great part a reward for his successful management of delicate negotiations at the Court of Rome, and chiefly in conciliating the French King, who had shown some hostility towards the Princes. No doubt the thanks expressed, and the very friendly tone of the letter, are largely occasioned by important services rendered by de Givry in this cause: they also point indirectly to a friendship between the two ecclesiastics and to the obligation Richardot was under to the Cardinal.

<sup>1</sup> The same Metz MS. 219, foll. 33<sup>v</sup>—36, where all these letters are reproduced *in extenso*.

The letter of the King of Spain to de Givry (of 15th July 1605) is an "affectionate request" to "our very dear and much beloved friend" to give help and counsel, whenever solicited, to one Doctor Joan Bautista Vinas, sent by the King with the concurrence of the Bishop of Valladolid, Inquisitor General, to reside at the Court of Rome and concern himself particularly with the affairs of the Holy Office of the Inquisition. We give the text of both these letters in the Appendix, nos. VIII and IX.

We must now turn to the new Nuncio, Guido Bentivoglio, who was on his way from Italy to Flanders. In the summer of 1607 Caraffa left Brussels to take up the nunciature at Madrid. By the end of July Bentivoglio had not yet reached his new residence. His "General Instruction" on assuming office, dated 5th June 1607, contained a clause about the Benedictines at Douai. His predecessor had been instructed to tell the English monks to try and find some other place, distant from Douai; but as perhaps he had not had time to attend to the matter, Bentivoglio in his turn is directed to persuade the Benedictines into complying with what seemed a very reasonable measure. The Instruction also indicates that as yet the motives of the Benedictines were not considered as purely religious, but tainted with a secret malicious intention of thwarting the Jesuits.<sup>1</sup> Bentivoglio entered Brussels on 9th August, and within two or three days received a letter from Cardinal Borghese, dated 21st July 1607. The writer says that he encloses "a memorial presented to our Lord the Pope in the name of the English Benedictine monks." This memorial would appear to be identical with the letter addressed to Paul V by Fr Bradshaw and his community, already mentioned (see p. 112 above). It is true that Cardinal Borghese says, with reference to it, that His Holiness has

<sup>1</sup> Cauchie-Maere, *Recueil des Instructions Générales aux Nonces de Flandres* (1596-1635), pp. 31-32.

given no order for the expulsion of the monks from the Archduke's *dominions*,<sup>1</sup> but only that they should not erect a seminary at *Douai*; it is true also that the letter of the monks to the Pope does not complain of a threatened expulsion from the Spanish Low Countries. But the Cardinal's meaning seems to be only, that the monks are to be reminded that the sentence is not so severe as it might have been, and as perhaps had been petitioned for by their adversaries.<sup>2</sup>

On 18th August Bentivoglio, answering the Cardinal's letter, said he had read the memorial and would comply with his chief's instructions.<sup>3</sup> But a week later, on the 25th, he writes again to say that within the last few days the Benedictines of *Douai* have come to him complaining bitterly, being also under the impression that His Holiness would not allow them to remain in any part of Flanders. Having spoken kindly to them, he assured them that the order was restricted to *Douai*, and gave them the reasons which had moved His Holiness to this decision. But still they showed themselves sorely disturbed, representing that if they left *Douai* they could no longer expect to receive alms from the Benedictine Abbots of the neighbourhood, and urging also the facilities for their studies offered by a University town. The Nuncio again did his best to soothe them, but said there was no choice but to obey the Pope, and finally sent them away with letters of recommendation to the Abbots in question, whom he

<sup>1</sup> A letter of William Collier to Dr Bagshaw, preserved in Weldon's MS. Collections I, p. 201, speaks of a petition, "preferred to the Archduke" and the Chief of his Council, "to command the Benedictines forth of the country." See *Dates and Documents* p. 44, where it is suggested that this letter (dated only 11th March) belongs to 1609—on the ground that it speaks of Dr Gifford as already a monk, and that he did not actually receive the habit till 11th July 1608. But it now appears that he had affiliated himself in some way to the Order early in 1607 (see his letter to de Givry of 13th April 1607, in *Rev. Bénéd.* for July 1900, p. 256); and the whole tenor of Collier's letter would much better fit the year 1607, or at least 1608.

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix, no. IV, for the text of the Cardinal's letter.

<sup>3</sup> Appendix, no. V.

begged to continue their former benefactions.<sup>1</sup> A later retrospective letter (of 10th January 1609) seems clearly to refer to this visit of the monks to the Nuncio and the events that followed. In the course of the interview, we are told, they brought forward strong reasons in justification of their action, and were upheld by certain Abbots of their Order, so that he was obliged to use some severity to induce them to comply with the Pope's injunction that they should quit Douai. When finally the Benedictines, "though with an incredible sense of injury," appeared to be making preparations to depart, a new order from Rome reached the Nuncio, which made it necessary for him to suspend the execution of the former.<sup>2</sup>

The "new order" in question we now have in our hands. It came in a letter from Cardinal Borghese dated 22nd September 1607,<sup>3</sup> which was received by Bentivoglio on or just before the 13th October, on which day he wrote to acknowledge it.<sup>4</sup> "The Benedictines of Douai," wrote the Cardinal, "are making great complaints here, and are unable to fall in with the order that they should make an establishment elsewhere. It is necessary that you should get precise information of the cause of their unwillingness to leave, and ascertain what good or harm might ensue should they be granted permission to settle at Douai. They complain of the Fathers of the Society." The Nuncio, the letter continues, is to

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, no. VI. These Abbots may well have been, in addition to Philip de Caverel of Arras, those of Anchin and Marchiennes; in 1614, and doubtless earlier, the Abbot of St Bertin was making some contribution to St Gregory's (letter of Fr Leander, of August 1614, among the Silos Papers).

<sup>2</sup> Bentivoglio to Cardinal Bianchetti, 10th Jan. 1609. Guilday, *op. cit.* p. 439.

<sup>3</sup> See Appendix, no. VII.

<sup>4</sup> Appendix to the second part of this article. In the Nuncio's reply there is nothing worthy of special note except that he says the Benedictines continue to complain bitterly of the order that they should leave Douai, and of the Jesuit Fathers. For the rest, he simply rehearses his instructions and says he will carry them out.



inform himself of the facts of the case as soon as possible, and in the meantime to delay the execution of the Pope's order until he receives further instructions.

Thus it was that soon after the middle of October 1607 the Benedictines learned that they had been granted a reprieve—or rather a respite, since the new order was by no means intended as a final settlement. The Nuncio was to look more closely into the case, report to Rome, and then wait for further instructions. But the monks were now given a hope that their reasons would be listened to and that their innocence might be vindicated. And in fact the order for their removal from Douai was never afterwards renewed. To what influence is this change of attitude in Rome to be ascribed? It was not due to any representations in favour of the English Benedictines on the part of Bentivoglio, for as yet he had made none; indeed he had hardly yet had time to acquire any real grasp of the situation. Nor could the few testimonials which the monks had been able to collect have reached Rome in time to bring about the change. On 28th August 1607 Philip III of Spain had forwarded to the Archduke a memorial (undated) which had been presented to him by the Procurator General of the Spanish Benedictine Congregation.<sup>1</sup> But this was probably never sent to Rome; nor, if it had been sent, could it have arrived before the dispatch of Cardinal Borghese's letter of 22nd September, which granted the reprieve. The purpose of the memorial was to solicit a letter from the King to the Archduke, asking him to favour the English monks and to allow Abbot Caverel to build them a monastery at Douai, as he had already offered to do; and naturally it spoke highly of the character of these monks, and of the noble object which they proposed to

<sup>1</sup> Mentioned by H. Lonchay and J. Cuvelier, *Correspondance de la Cour d'Espagne sur les Affaires des Pays-Bas au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, p. 267, no. 611 (Brussels, 1923). There are photographs of the letter and memorial at Downside.

themselves in the English mission. But in forwarding this memorial the King asked only for the Archduke's advice, giving no hint as to any wishes of his own. Again, the monks obtained from the Magistrates of Douai a testimonial of their good and peaceful behaviour while they had been in the town, which was a year or so<sup>1</sup>; and the Rector Magnificus had testified that they had been duly admitted to live in the University.<sup>2</sup> But the Magistrates' testimony is dated 12th October 1607, and that of the Rector was probably given about the same time: therefore too late to have helped at the really critical moment. The Benedictines were being helped in Rome itself "by their protectors" there, to whom Cardinal Borghese alludes in his next letter (of 27th October). And the chief of these, there can be little doubt, was Cardinal de Givry. That he had for some time past been exerting himself in their favour is clear from a letter written to him by Fr Bradshaw on 18th August before: Fr Bradshaw had just received a letter from the Cardinal that filled him with joy and hope, and he mentions other letters sent by the same Cardinal to Jean Richardot, Bishop of Arras, by which that prelate "factus est summus amicus et patronus tenuitatis nostræ, spondetque suum nobis in omni causa patrocinium."<sup>3</sup> Possibly, therefore, the Bishop also had put in a word for the monks at Rome.

The Benedictines had now regained much of their lost ground; but there remained one last advantage to secure—the final consent of the Archduke.

(to be continued)

<sup>1</sup> Printed in *Dates and Documents*, p. 28, from an old authenticated copy at Downside. It is also mentioned by Weldon.

<sup>2</sup> Mentioned by Weldon, who does not give the text or the date. See *Dates and Documents*, p. 10.

<sup>3</sup> *Rev. Bénédictine*, October 1936, p. 345.

APPENDIX OF DOCUMENTS<sup>1</sup>

## I

The Nuncio Decio Caraffa to Cardinal Borghese  
(20th January 1607)

*Ex Archiv. Vat., Fondo Borghese Serie II, vol. 100, fol. 17 (antico) 19 (moderno).*

Illmo e Rmo Sr Padron colenmo.

Il Presidente del collegio di Duai della nation Inglese mi ha dato il memoriale che sarà con questa, per inviarlo a V.S. Illma acciò N. Sre sia informato del contenuto in esso. Io ho giudicato espediente procurar, che per hora non habbia effetto il pensiero dei Padri Benedettini Inglesi, sin tanto che S. Bne non ordini quel ch' in questo debba farsi, e ne starò aspettando il commando. Faccio a V.S. Illma humilissima riverenza, e le prego da Dio felicissima vita. Di Brusselles alli xx. di Gennaro 1607.

Di V.S. Illma e Rma Humilissmo et obligmo servitore

Decio Arciv<sup>o</sup> di Damasco.

Illmo Sigr Card. Borghese.

*(The Memorial is wanting.)*

## II.

Cardinal Borghese to Decio Caraffa  
(17th February 1607)

*Ex Bibl. Vat., Cod. Barber. vol. 5919, fol. 215-216.<sup>2</sup>*

Al Nunzio in Fiandra

Rappresentano qui un gran disordine gl'affezionati al Collegio degl'Inglesi di Duaco, quando si permetta che nel medemo [*sic*] luogo facciano un Seminario li Padri Benedettini, come procurano di fare. Perciò essendosi fatta riflessione sopra il memoriale inviato da V.S. con le lettere delli 20. del passato, si giudica espediente per fuggire l'emulationi e discordie, di persuadere alli detti Benedettini, che sarà molto meglio erigere il Seminario sudetto in altro luogo lontano dal Duaco, che<sup>3</sup> nella Città istessa, dovendosi procurare maggior tempo d'essercitare la loro pietà, e di accrescere il culto Divino col loro buon esempio. Faccia V.S. in questo particolare gl'officii che convengono, ma in modo che non dia occasione di querele, e s'informi minutamente di tutto quello che le parrà necessario per fare il servitio del Signore con maggior quiete et edificatione. Alla sua prudenza si rimette il modo di trattare il negotio. E per fine le prego ogni vero bene.—Di Roma li 17. Febraro 1607.

<sup>1</sup> The Appendix will be continued after the second part of the article.

<sup>2</sup> There is another copy in the Fondo Borghese, Serie II vol. 489, fol. 132 (antico) 134 (moderno), dated wrongly "17. Febraro 1617."

<sup>3</sup> So the Borghese copy; the Barberini has "e".

## III.

Father Augustine Bradshaw to Nicholas Fitzherbert in Rome  
(26th, or 16th, March 1607)

*Ex Archiv. Vat., Fondo Borghese Serie III, vol. 45c., fol. 7 (antico) 8 (moderno).*<sup>1</sup>

Da Fiandra alli 26. di Marzo 1607.

Tenevo speranza, che havendo noi superate et più volte, le oppositioni, et hora ultimamente le difficoltà fatte contra di noi appresso questo Serenissimo Arciduca, havessimo di stare in pace; ma adesso mi accorgo del contrario, et che quelli che ci oppugnano, vanno tentando ogni altra strada, et ancor per via di Roma: là dove per essere nessuno di noi per poter' ribattere le lor calornie, pensano di prevalersene. Perchè quà si dice per cosa certa, che il Presidente de Inglese (*sic*)<sup>2</sup> in Douai, ad instigatione de' padri Giesuiti della sua natione, ha mandato una supplica al papa, non solamente per far' levare noi da Douai, ma ancora per rivocare la nostra missione in Inghilterra, sottoscritta da molti, quali mai l'hanno sentita, nè sanno che contiene, cosa che procurarono similmente l'altro anno contra di me con l'arcivescovo di Malines, per farmi levare dal campo, se havessero potuto farlo. Le cose che ci oppongono, et hanno altre volte opposte, sono. Che noi siamo huomini fattiosi. Che non volemo esser guidati dalli padri della Compagnia. Che andamo per altra via, che essi non vanno. Che il Re d'Inghilterra, et quel Stato ci ha mandati, et ci mantiene quà solamente per opporci alli Giesuiti, et per rovinare i Seminarii. Tutte queste cose essi hanno già dette quà a Sua Altezza, al vescovo sotto el qual vivemo,<sup>3</sup> alli abbati del nostro Ordine che ci mantengano, et ci danno a vivere. Et queste senza dubbio suggereranno a N.S. Il che se fossero huomini apostolici per certo che non farebbono, nè tentarebbono per si mala via ad impedir' i nostri progressi indirizzati solamente all' honor di Dio, e alla salute et conversione della nostra patria. Questo tanto dico adesso a V.S. per causa di una lettera, che mi è stata mandata dal Nuntio di N.S.<sup>re</sup> che resiede appresso a Sua Altezza, del tenore seguente.

Reverende Pater. Cum ab eo tempore, quo mecum Bruxellis egeras de monasterio, sive aliquo religiosorum Ordinis Sancti Benedicti numero congregando Duaci, occurrerit, quod tibi denunciandum erit: cumque illud magis te præsente fieri, quam absente per litteras expediri iudicaverim; volui te denuo, ob illam causam hunc locum repetere: quem ubi accesseris, a nobis plenius accipies quid commendandum censuimus. Quod quo citius fiat, eo magis nostro desiderio ac voluntati satisfactum intelligas. Deus te incolumen (*sic*) servet. Bruxellis 8. Martii 1607. Uti frater. Decius Archiepiscopus Damascenus.

Vedendo quei nostri amici che eravamo già firmati in Douai con buona licenza, et del Arciduca, et del Vescovo Diocesano, procurarono che il

<sup>1</sup> There is another, less accurate, copy at Monte Cassino, from which the letter was printed in *Dates and Documents* p. 62. As that is a privately printed collection, it seems desirable to print the letter here again *in extenso*. As regards the date, the Monte Cassino copy has "alli sedici di Marzo" (i.e. 16th March, written in full); and as the figure 1 was often so written in the seventeenth century as to be easily mistaken now for a 2, it seemed possible that "26" might be only an error of modern transcription; but recurrence to the MS. confirmed "26."

<sup>2</sup> The Monte Cassino copy has here: "il Presidente Inglese Douai" (*sic*). Perhaps read either "il Presidente Inglese in Douai," or "il Presidente de' Inglesi in Douai"?

<sup>3</sup> The Monte Cassino copy has "vivono" ("they live"), and so, it may be guessed, has the Vatican copy; for so the modern transcriber first copied it, correcting then to "vivamo," "we live," which is expected in the context.

Nuntio ci scrivesse a questo modo. Al quale io rescritti, scusandomi di non poter venire a trovarlo per all' hora, et per lo molto che haveva da fare per ordine de' miei superiori; et per mancamento ancora di denari: Igitur precatus sum, ut me excusatum haberet, donec mihi suppeteret pecuniarum facultas et veniendi opportunitas. Et si quid erat, quod mihi commendatum voluit, per suas litteras a fideli amico dandas significare dignaretur. Id perinde mihi fore, ac si præsenti in os diceretur.

Da questo V.S. può vedere che gran travagli havemo da aspettare ancora da Roma, se questi possono ottenere ciò che dimanderanno, et se noi non siamo aiutati, et la nostra innocenza et causa giustissima difesa appresso alla Santità di N.Sre.

A questi inconvenienti darebbe rimedio, o sollevamento se si potesse procurare da N.Sre o da qualche Ill<sup>mi</sup> Cardinali lettere a Mons<sup>r</sup> Nontio di favorire la nostra giustitia et quiete; et all' abbate di Santo Vedasti per animarlo di andar' inanzi con l'aiutarci, come fa. Et per l'amor di Dio procurateci queste presto, poichè vedete con quanta diligenza altri cercano a farci danno.<sup>1</sup>

## IV.

Cardinal Borghese to the Nuncio Guido Bentivoglio  
(21st July 1607)

*Ex Bibl. Vat., Cod. Barber. 5919, fol. 277.*

Alla ricevuta di questa presuppongo che V.S. havrà finito il suo viaggio, e con buona salute, come desidero. Qui aggiunta sarà copia d'un memoriale presentato a Nostro Signore, a nome delli Monaci Benedettini Inglesi. Non ha dato ordine Sua Santità ch'essi siano scacciati dalli stati di cotesta Altezza, ma si bene che non fabbrichino in Duaco il nuovo Seminario, come lei sà. Occorrendo V.S. dichiarì la mente di Nostro Signore che è tale. E per fine etc. Di Roma li 21. Luglio 1607.

## V.

Guido Bentivoglio to Cardinal Borghese  
(18th August 1607)

*Ex Archiv. Vat., Fondo Borghese Serie II vol. 100, fol. 171.*

Ill<sup>mo</sup> e R<sup>mo</sup> Sigre e Padron mio Colmo.

Ho veduto quel, che nel memoriale delli Monaci Benedettini si contiene, a' quali all'occasione farò sapere quanto V.S. Ill<sup>ma</sup> commanda, cioè, che la mente di Nostro Sig<sup>re</sup> non è, che si levino da questi Stati, ma solo, che non habbiano a fabricare il Seminario in Duaco. E per fine a V.S. Ill<sup>ma</sup> bacio humilissimamente le mani. Di Brusselles li 18. d'Agosto 1607.

Di V.S. Ill<sup>ma</sup> e R<sup>ma</sup> Humiliss<sup>mo</sup> e devot<sup>mo</sup> Servitore

Guido Arcivo di Rhodi.

Ill<sup>mo</sup> Sig<sup>r</sup> Card. Borghese.

## VI.

The same to the same  
(25th August 1607)

*Ibidem, fol. 180.*

Ill<sup>mo</sup> (etc., as above)

Vennero a trovarmi questi giorni passati i Benedettini di Duaco, e si dolsero grandemente dubitando, che fusse vero quell'ordine, che N.Sre

<sup>1</sup> The Monte Cassino copy has at the end: "Il P.D. Agostino Priore di Douai al P.D. Anselmo Inglese in Ror a." But this must be the mistake of some archivist, for D. Anselm Beech was not yet in Rome. There can be no doubt that the letter was written to Nicholas Fitzherbert, with whom Fr Bradshaw was in regular correspondence at this time.

non li volesse in parte alcuna di Fiandra. Io doppo havergli consolati gli dissi, che l'ordine si restringeva solamente a Duaco, e gli mostrai le ragioni, c'h'avean mosso Sua Santità a far questo. Restando essi anche grandemente afflitti di questa determinatione, e mostrando di dubitare, che se partissero di Duaco non saria stata loro somministrata più elemosina alcuna da' gli Abbati di S. Benedetto vicino a Duaco da' i quali l'h'avevano prima, e per la vicinanza, e per l'occasione degli studii, ai quali potevano commodamente attendere stando in quella Università, io gli andai acquetando, e mostrai ch'ad ogni modo bisognava ubbidir' a N. Sre, e finalmente gli accompagnai con lettere di raccomandatione a' i sudetti Abbati, pregandogli a prestar loro quell' aiuti fuori, c'h'avean fatto in Duaco. Con questo si spediron da me. Anderò di mano in mano facendo in ciò quel che sarà necessario per levar le dissensioni più che sia possibile tra gli ecclesiastici di questi paesi. E le bacio per fine humilissimamente le mani.—Di Bruxelles li 25. d'Agosto 1607.

Di V.S. Illma (etc., as before)

Guido Arcivo di Rhodi.

## VII.

Cardinal Borghese to Guido Bentivoglio  
(22nd September 1607)

*Ex. Bibl. Vat., Cod. Barber. 5919, fol. 293.*

Fanno gran doglianze qui li Benedettini di Duaco, nè si possono accomodare all'ordine dato di pensare di fabricare altrove. E necessario che V.S. s'informi minutamente della causa che si muove a non partire, e del bene o male che succedesse, dandosi loro licenza di fermarsi in Duaco; si lamentano de' Padri Gesuiti. Vedrà V.S. gl'interessi loro facilmente col mezzo della sua diligenza, la quale farà quanto prima, et in tanto trattenga l'essecutione del commandamento di Nostro Signore di domandarli in altri luoghi, sin che habbia nuovo ordine di quanto dovrà fare. La saluto per fine con tutto l'animo. Di Roma li 22. Settembre 1607.

## VIII.

The Archdukes Albert and Isabella to Cardinal de Givry  
(14 April 1604)

*MS.219 of the Town Library at Metz, foll. 17v-18.*

Mon Cousin,

Comme le Prieur commendataire de Mortau, M<sup>re</sup> Jean Richardot,<sup>1</sup> est dénommé à l'Evesché d'Arras en nostre pays et Comté d'Arthois, et que à ladite cause il n'en peut longuement demeurer absent, ne pouvons différer de le rappeler de cette Cour, et par telle occasion vous remercier des faveurs et assistances que vous luy avez fait et donné en ce qui s'est offert pour nos affaires comme nous [nous] asseurons que feréz de mesme affection à l'endroit de nostre Conseiller et grand Chappelain Don Pedro de Toledo, que nous envoyons présentement, pour de nostre part résider en icelle Cour pour recevoir les commendementz de Sa Stete en ce que concernera le bien de ces nos pays d'Embas et de Bourgogne, et faire et faire [sic, repeated] les debvoirs ausquelz sommes obligéz, comme l'entendrez de nostre dit grand Chappelain, auquel avons ordonné de vous

<sup>1</sup> "At an early date," says V. Brants (*Biographie Nationale*, Brussels 1906, vol. 19 p. 281), "he was given the priory of Mortau (*Mortua Aquæ*), and was sometimes known by the name of Monsieur de Mortau."

visiter, et offrir toute amitié de nostre part mesme pour l'assurance qu'avons qu'en toutes occasions luy donnerez vers Sadite Stete la mesme assistance et faveur comme vous en prions. Et de nostre costé ne fauldront de corespondre de reciproque amitié en vostre endroit, comme entendrez de luy plus particulièrement, a quoy nous nous remettons, priants le Créateur vous avoir, Mon Cousin, en sa Sainte Garde. De Bruxelles le 14 Apl. 1604. Ainsy signé :

Vos bons Cousins Albert et Isabelle, et plus bas, A. de Laloo.

## IX.

Philip III of Spain to Cardinal de Givry

(15th July 1605)

*Ibidem*, fol 36.

Al muy Rdo in Christo padre Cardinale Iebri nño muy Charo, y muy amado amigo.

Don Philippe por la gracia de Dios Rey de Castilla, de Leon, d'Aragon, de las dos Sicilias, de Hierusalem, de Portugal, de Navarra, y de las Indias etc. a muy Reverendo in Christo Padre Cardenal Iebri, nño muy Charo y muy amado amigo.

El doctor Joan Bautista Vinas que esta dara, por mi mandado con acuerdo del Obispo de Valladolid, Inquisitor general y los del nostro Consejo de la sancta general Inquisicion a de residir en questa Corte, y entender especialmente en las cosas y negocios del Sancto Officio de la Inquisition, Rogamos os, muy affectuosamente que siempre que a vos recurriere por cosas de su cargo, Le ayudeis y favorescáis quanto convenga, y le tengais por muy encomendado, favoreciendo las cosas del Sancto Officio, con la voluntad y zelo que sabeis siempre Yo le he tenido y tengo, pues tanto importa para la observacion de Nña sancta fee catholica, y a la autoridad de la Sancta Sede Appca, que demas que en ello hareis lo que conviene a Vño habito, y profession, Yo lo recibire en singular complacencia, y sea Muy Reverendo in xpo padre Cardenal Iebri nño muy Charo y muy amado amigo nño Señor en Vña continua guarda—de Lerma a 15 de Julio 1605.

Yo El Rey (et plus bas),

Don Pedro Franques.

# THE SETTLING OF THE ENGLISH BENEDICTINES AT DOUAI

AS SEEN CHIEFLY THROUGH UNPUBLISHED DOCUMENTS OF  
THE VATICAN ARCHIVES (1607-1611)

By FRÉDÉRIC FABRE

(Concluded)

## III.

WE have seen that the order for the removal of the English monks from Douai was suspended by a letter of Cardinal Borghese to the Nuncio dated 22nd September 1607. The letter reached Bentivoglio about October 13th, on which day he answered it, saying that he would carry out the new instruction, would try to learn why it was that the Benedictines were so unwilling to depart, and would do his best to penetrate to the root of the whole trouble.<sup>1</sup> On 27th October the Cardinal writes to him again to say that the Benedictines are making great efforts in opposition to those who wish to have them turned out of Douai, that they adduce many reasons in support of their cause, and "are helped by their protectors"—chief among whom, there can be little doubt, was Cardinal de Givry. The Holy Father's only wish, he says, is that the service of God should be promoted in those parts. The Nuncio is again urged to discover the "quality" of the monks and what harm they might do if allowed to settle at Douai, and in particular he is directed to ascertain the opinion of the Archduke.<sup>2</sup> The policy of Rome in this affair was throughout dispassionate and impartial, and marked by a desire to learn and be guided by the true facts of the case. It is also characteristic of this attitude that we nowhere find the Cardinal Nephew hinting at the use of force as a means of solving the difficulties.

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, no. X.

<sup>2</sup> Appendix, no. XI.



The injunction to consult with the Archduke was renewed a week later, on November 3rd.<sup>1</sup> The Nuncio was requested to use dispatch, as representations in favour of the Benedictines were repeatedly being made in Rome ; and the Cardinal says again that " nothing is desired here but that which may best conduce to the public weal." Before the arrival of this letter, perhaps on receipt of the previous one, Bentivoglio wrote, on 17th November, that the case of the Benedictines at Douai was one that needed to be handled with the greatest caution and circumspection ; otherwise new complications might arise and further discords be stirred up. The Archduke was absent from Brussels, but was expected to return shortly, when the writer would consult him and ascertain his views.<sup>2</sup> On 24th November he wrote again to the Cardinal acknowledging three letters from the latter, all of date 3rd November, and stating that he had nothing further to add to his last letter, so far as the Benedictines were concerned.<sup>3</sup> Evidently he had not yet seen the Archduke.

It was not till the first week of December that the desired interview took place. On 8th December the Nuncio writes to the Cardinal Nephew that the Archduke was able to give him no further light in the matter than he already had. His Highness, however, was of opinion that as long as the parties were not separated the dissensions between them would never cease ; and as regards the separation to be effected, it seemed to him more reasonable that the Benedictines should retire, as they were new-comers at Douai and had no special undertaking in hand. The Nuncio adds, that in order to come to a more mature decision the Archduke advised him to confer with Richardot the President of his Privy Council.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Guilday, *op. cit.* p. 438, where the letter is printed. It is there by a slip attributed to Card. Barberini.

<sup>2</sup> Appendix, no. XII.

<sup>3</sup> Appendix, no. XIII.

<sup>4</sup> Appendix, no. XIV.

Jean Grusset, "dit Richardot," was at this time about 67 years of age. He was to die within two years, on 3rd September 1609, at Arras. He was the father of Jean Richardot (1573-1614), now Bishop of Arras and shortly to be Archbishop of Cambrai, whose favour Cardinal de Givry had enlisted for the English Benedictines; and he was nephew to François Richardot (1507-1574), also Bishop of Arras, who in the later years of his life had played a prominent part in starting and organising the University of Douai. It was through his uncle, whose name he adopted, that the elder Jean Richardot received a first-rate education, won the patronage of Cardinal Granvelle, and rose in the scale of honours. In 1597 he was promoted to the office of Chef-Président to the Archduke's Council, and in that capacity acted as a sort of prime minister. One of his most recent biographers represents him as on the whole an opportunist rather than a man of high principles.<sup>1</sup> He was a skilful diplomatist, supple and insinuating, though on occasion he could show signs of force as well, as when in 1609 he stoutly rejected the book of James I against the authority of the Supreme Pontiff.

On 12th January 1608 Bentivoglio wrote to Cardinal Borghese that he had now had a long talk with Richardot. They were both of the opinion, as was the Archduke, that the best solution was that the Benedictines should go. "It seems to his Highness that the course which had been thought of before, and as to which I received order from our Holy Father on my first arrival here, should be taken now again, which is that the Benedictines should leave Douai and settle in some other place, not far from the Abbots of their Order who have hitherto maintained them—assuming that they will not thus be

<sup>1</sup> V. Brants. *Un ministre belge au xvii<sup>e</sup> siècle, Jean Richardot, chef-président du Conseil privé des Pays Bas (1597-1609)*. "Bull. de l'Académie Royale de Belgique," August 1901. Another account by the same writer in the *Biographie Nationale*, Brussels 1906, vol. 19, pp. 374-9.

deprived of that help (*presupponendosi che non sia lor per mancarne*). There seems to be no other means of remedying the existing disorders between the Benedictines and the Seminary ; and for my own part I can think of no other. If His Holiness thinks proper to adopt this course and will give me order concerning it, I will carry it out in the way that seems most proper.”<sup>1</sup> Thus, from the side of the authorities at Brussels the matter seemed at an end, and it remained only to await the word from Rome. But that word never came.

#### IV.

After the letter of 12th January 1608 there is a long interval of silence, the next letter that we have being one written by the Nuncio to Cardinal Borghese on 24th May of that year. But however gloomy the prospects of the monks may have been at this period, we can see that no order had been issued by Rome for their expulsion. In tracing the course of events, even if we arbitrarily restricted ourselves to the exchange of views between Brussels and Rome, this next letter would be seen to mark a turning of the tide in favour of the Benedictines. “The Benedictine Fathers of Douai,” says the Nuncio, “have just been to see me ; and by occasion of that George Gervase of their order who last month was put to death by the King of England, as I informed your Illustrious Lordship, they have greatly enhanced their cause, and by this proof have most effectually brought me to understand that they are living here in Flanders as good and faithful religious ought to live, and that their institute has no other end in view than it ought to have, which is the maintaining and advancement of the Catholic faith ; and consequently one can recognise how false are the imputations that have been made

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, no. XV.

against them. They have asked me to represent this to His Holiness and to your Illustrious Lordship, and as I judged that I ought not to refuse them this service, I have written the present letter for that purpose.”<sup>1</sup>

The effect of this letter in Rome may be judged by Cardinal Borghese’s reply to it, dated 14th June 1608 : “In every way that I can I will promptly favour the Benedictine Fathers of Douai, and I have already made relation to our Lord the Pope of their zeal, according to the testimony of your Lordship.”<sup>2</sup> The martyrdom of Blessed George Gervase is referred to again some eight months later by the Nuncio in writing confidentially to Cardinal Bianchetti on 10th January 1609. Last year, he says, in the month of April, George Gervase was put to death for refusing the Oath, and he was publicly proclaimed as a religious of the Order of St Benedict, both in his sentence and in the accounts circulated through a letter of the Spanish Ambassador in London to the one at Brussels : which letter the Nuncio had seen. The Benedictines accordingly had had a picture made representing the Martyr in the habit of St Benedict. Shortly afterwards the authorities of the English College of Douai produced a second picture, representing the Martyr as a secular priest, and with an inscription in more than one language to say that the report of his being a Benedictine was untrue. On the appearance of this second picture the Benedictines made bitter complaints to the Nuncio of the injury thus done them ; and as the other side had made no such protest on the appearance of the first picture, the Nuncio concluded that the party which lodged the complaint had a just grievance.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, no. XVI.

<sup>2</sup> Appendix, no. XVII.

<sup>3</sup> Appendix, no. XIX. Both the pictures spoken of above have been preserved, and reproductions of them may be seen in Dom Bede Camm’s book *Nine Martyr Monks* (London, 1931) opposite pp. 45 and 98.

The life of Blessed George Gervase has been written by Dom Bede Camm.<sup>1</sup> He was a student of Douai College, from which he was ordained in 1603 and sent to England in the following year. In July 1606, after some months' imprisonment, he was banished. After a short time spent at the College at Douai, he made a pilgrimage to Rome, returning to the College in July 1607. Shortly before his return to England, which was in September of that year, he secretly received the habit of a novice from Father Augustine Bradshaw, and died on 11th April (O.S.) professing himself a monk of St Benedict. His case was somewhat special and peculiarly apt to make an impression at Rome, since he not only refused the Oath in obedience to the brief of Paul V (of 22nd September 1606), but being pressed on the question of the Pope's deposing power he boldly answered: "I say that the Pope can depose kings and emperors when they deserve it."<sup>2</sup>

We must now turn back to ask what had happened during the interval between 12th January and 24th May 1608. How is it that before the news of the martyrdom of George Gervase had reached Rome the unanimous advice of the Archduke, President Richardot and the Nuncio had not been acted upon? Some powerful intervention must have taken place in the meanwhile, and we cannot but think of Dom Anselm Beech, familiarly known as "Don Anselmo," an English monk of the Cassinese Congregation, who had now come to Rome as the accredited agent of the English monks. He is described by Father Baker as "a grave judicious and stayed man, and had beene (if my memory do not the more deceave me in it) a maister of art in Cambridge before his comminge thence,"<sup>3</sup> and there can be no

<sup>1</sup> See the last note.

<sup>2</sup> P.R.O., Roman transcripts (Bliss). An account of the trial dated 23rd April 1608. Camm, *op. cit.* p. 90.

<sup>3</sup> *Catholic Record Society*, vol. XXXIII, p. 163.

question but that the adversaries of the Benedictines found in him a redoubtable opponent. He arrived in Rome about the end of November 1607, as appears from a letter of his written to Frederick Cardinal Borromeo on the 30th of that month. D. Anselm's activities during the year 1608 can be traced in outline from two letters of his written to Cardinal Borromeo at Milan, on 5th April (Holy Saturday) 1608 and 28th March 1609, with the second of which he enclosed copies of the whole dossier of papers which he had presented in Rome for the case of the monks.<sup>1</sup> It does not appear that Cardinal Borromeo took any active part in the proceedings, as there are no intermediate letters to him and the two just mentioned contain no appeal for or mention of his intervention in what was going on at Rome. But he was an old friend of D. Anselm and in 1601 had presented a petition to Clement VIII in favour of the grant of missionary faculties to the English monks of the Cassinese Congregation.<sup>2</sup> The chief ally at Rome must still have been Cardinal de Givry, at least till his departure from Rome at the end of September 1608. On 27th April 1609 D. Anselm concludes a letter to him with assurances of the prayers of his brethren, "since in you we trust most and to you we owe most after God and His saints."<sup>3</sup> Another ally was Cardinal Montalto, grand-nephew of Sixtus V and Protector of the Cassinese and Spanish Benedictines.

Shortly after his arrival in Rome D. Anselm had an audience of the Pope and delivered to him some of the

<sup>1</sup> All these letters and other papers are printed (the Italian documents only in an English translation) in the volume of State Papers from Milan edited by A. B. Hinds, 1912. A summary of their contents is given by Dom H. Connolly in *Dates and Documents*, pp. 31-42. Some of the documents D. Anselm had probably brought with him to Rome, as Fr Leander's *Defensio* of Sept. 1607; others, dated 1608, must have been sent to him in the course of that year.

<sup>2</sup> C.R.S., XXXIII, p. 172-3.

<sup>3</sup> *Revue Bénédictine*, October 1930, p. 364.

papers he had brought with him (*quædam memorialia*). In Rome, he says, much the same sort of calumnies were afloat as beyond the Alps, but here they were whispered only in private (*clam et timide*). At length, at the beginning of Lent 1608, he got information that certain charges had been formulated in writing by Father Persons and were being shown to some of the Cardinals. He tried long but in vain to secure a copy of this document in order to reply to it.<sup>1</sup> The adversaries, on the contrary, were anxious that he should commit himself by accusing them in writing; but this he refused to do, saying that he had come to Rome to defend his brethren, not to accuse others. He then suggested that the whole cause should be submitted to the decision of two arbiters, and proposed the Jesuit and Benedictine Cardinals Bellarmine and de Givry. But this was declined by the adversaries, who wished to name their own umpires. Finally, after prolonged altercation, in the month of October he obtained from the Pope that the case should be tried by the Congregation of the Holy Office.

From a letter of Fr Persons to Paul V, dated 6th July 1608, it appears that the Pope had some time before entertained the idea of commissioning a Cardinal of the Holy Office to examine and decide on the case; and Fr Persons now recommends that this plan be put into execution, since fresh complaints are arriving from all parts, Douai, Valladolid, England and Flanders, about the controversy with the English Benedictines. It is necessary, he says, to have an effectual remedy that will cover everything and put a final end to the affair: "there are so many new memorials to Cardinal Farnese about the matter, which he will communicate to Your Holiness.

<sup>1</sup> He had seen a copy before the case was concluded, for his answers to the charges, eight in number, form one of the papers submitted by him. These answers, with the gist of the objections are printed in Dodd-Tierney IV, pp. ccviii *et seq.* The charges or objections themselves are printed separately and in full in the *English Hist. Rev.* IV, pp. 731 *et seq.*, from the British Museum MS. Addit. 21203 fol. 14.

## The English Benedictines at Douai 299

I told him of the good plan of Your Holiness and the person whom, amongst others, You had thought of, and he was highly pleased.”<sup>1</sup> The person alluded to is no doubt Cardinal Bianchetti, the Vice-Protector of England, who seems eventually to have had special charge of the case. And his choice must have given pleasure to the party of Fr Persons. Two years later he was to be instrumental in defeating the mission of More and Richard Smith in behalf of the secular clergy, and in frustrating the appeals addressed to the Pontiff by the representatives of the Archpriest Birkhead.<sup>2</sup> That Cardinal Farnese too, the Protector, so closely allied by blood to the descendants of Charles V of Spain, should have favoured the side of Fr Persons is natural enough. Had not the Appellants in August 1602, with the support of the French Ambassador, objected to having their cause placed in the hands of Cardinal Farnese, because of his dependency on Spain and consequent partiality for the Jesuits?<sup>3</sup>

Part of one at least of the memorials sent to Cardinal Farnese has survived. It is a letter from Dr Worthington to the Cardinal Protector, dated from Douai 17th May 1608, in which he complains of the reception of Blessed George Gervase into the Benedictine Order by the monks of Douai without the consent, or even knowledge, of himself as President of the English College. His words are copied in the margin of that picture of the Martyr, in the habit of a secular priest, of which we have already spoken.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, no. XVIII.

<sup>2</sup> Dodd-Tierney, V, p. 27.

<sup>3</sup> T. G. Law, *The Archpriest Controversy*, II, p. 57 (London, 1898).

<sup>4</sup> P. 295 above. The picture is given by Dom Bede Camm, *op. cit.*, opposite p. 98; the marginal extract is printed on p. 99. The picture, judging from the original photograph, seems to have been pasted on to a sheet of paper, leaving a wide margin on the right. For purposes of reproduction the margin had to be cut away. Dom Bede Camm found it in the Vatican Library, but he does not say in what volume.



Towards the end of the autumn it was becoming apparent that the opposition was not likely to gain its point. Fr Persons himself foresaw that the decision would not be entirely favourable, as appears from a letter of his to Dr. Worthington. This letter has been reproduced, without date, by Taunton in his *History of the Jesuits* (pp. 348-9) from the *Catholic Miscellany*, vol. II, p. 206. It is to be found also in the French translation of Dodd's anonymous *History of the English College* (p. 180), where the date given is 30th September, 1608. But as at the very beginning Fr Persons acknowledges Dr Worthington's last dated October 29th, it seems probable that the date of his own letter was *November 30th*. Alluding to letters of Dr Worthington which have been "received and well liked," and others that have "come in very good time," Fr Persons proceeds: "We think certainly the matter will be ended out of hand," and further on, ". . . we have had letters enough to show the truth, and we doubt not but Almighty God will work by them that which shall be to His greater glory; *although not perhaps in such sorts as seems best to us.*"

The decision came on 10th December 1608, when the *Regulae Observandae* drawn up by the Holy Office received the sanction of the Sovereign Pontiff. This document is printed in Latin by Dom Bede Camm in Appendix H. to his *Life of Blessed John Roberts*<sup>1</sup>; but the original was almost certainly the Italian which is printed in the *English Historical Review*, vol. IV (1889), pp. 737-8. The MS. used for this edition was the "Ambrosiana, G. 202, no. 149" at Milan, which can be identified with the copy of the *Regulae* sent by D. Anselm Beech to Frederick Cardinal Borromeo on 28th March 1609; and the editor tells us (on p. 731) that the transcript was collated by the Librarian of the Ambrosiana,

<sup>1</sup> *A Benedictine Martyr in England*, etc. (London, 1897), pp. 300-302. The text was taken from the Westminster Archives, VIII, p. 401.

## The English Benedictines at Douai 301

Abate (afterwards Mgr.) Ceriani, a world-famed scholar. The following is a translation of the Italian text, from which, as will presently be noted, the Latin differs somewhat curiously in two or three places.

Rules to be observed by the fathers of the Order of St Benedict and the fathers of the Society of Jesus for the preserving of that concord which ought to exist between religious men towards the service of God and the propagation of the Catholic religion in the realm of England: ordained by our Most Holy Lord Pope Paul V on the 10th of December 1608 in the Congregation of the Holy Office.

In the first place, all discords and animosities hitherto existing are to be consigned to perpetual oblivion, the one side and the other condoning with all possible good will and charity those injuries which they supposed to have been done them.

The Jesuit fathers are to observe, and cause to be observed by their alumni, those rules which were established by our Holy Father before he was Pope (*quando era in minoribus*) and were subscribed by His Holiness and the Lord Cardinal Farnese in the year of Jubilee 1600.<sup>1</sup>

And under pain of excommunication, and other (penalties) to be imposed by the Rev. Father General, they are not to attempt, directly or indirectly, to hinder any alumnus of their colleges who wishes to enter the Order of St Benedict or any other religious Order approved by this Holy See.

The Benedictine fathers are not to invite or exhort any of the alumni of the colleges of the Jesuit fathers to enter their Order, even under the name of Oblates. And moreover, as well before as after the reception of the aforesaid, they are to comply with all things that their Rule enjoins; and in the reception of those who desire to take the habit of St Benedict these things shall be observed without any difference made between English and those of other nations.

<sup>1</sup>Under cap. 5 of those earlier Rules the case was dealt with of students of the English College at Douai who before ordination should decide to become religious: "Alumni praesentandi pro susceptione Sacrorum Ordinum non tenebuntur revelare intentionem, quam interius habent, transeundi ad aliquam Religionem quae habeat Missionem in Angliam, cum tam in Religione quam in Clericatu teneantur ad nutum Superioris Angliam petere, ibique cooperari. Quod si ad alias Religiones transire voluerint, tuta conscientia reticere id non debent," etc. (unpublished). But this was before the Benedictine mission was granted, and it might be argued therefore that the clause did not apply to the Benedictine Order.

Neither the Benedictine fathers nor the fathers of the Society shall have power to send into England any one who has entered their Order unless he has first completed his year, or years, of noviceship and has performed all the exercises which those of other nations who enter their Orders are obliged to by their constitutions. And no Abbot or Rector shall have independent power (*possa a suo arbitrio*) to arrange for the sending of his subjects into England without the consent of the Provincial, or (other) superior, or of the Visitor in that province; and these are to give account of the missions to the Illustrious Protectors here, who will then make relation to our Lord the Pope.

They are to attend with one accord to the conversion of souls, avoiding familiarity, so far as is possible, with those who have taken, or exhort others to take, to the King of England the oaths condemned by His Holiness, or who shall propose new forms thereof without first rendering account, as above, to the Illustrious Protectors.

*They shall not intervene in the political affairs of that kingdom; and if perchance they have realised that by such intervention benefit may accrue to souls, they are first to inform their superiors nearest to England, and these are to write to the Illustrious Protectors here, who will then refer the matter to His Holiness;*<sup>1</sup> and let them devote their attention solely to converting the heretics and encouraging the Catholics, with as much unanimity as possible.

None of those who here in Rome have conducted these negotiations touching the past discords between them, whether before His Holiness or the Sacred Congregation, shall be at liberty to go to England without the licence of His Holiness. Neither shall they attack or provoke each other, in writing or by word, *in genere* or *in specie*, but shall speak and write of one another with all respect and reverence always.

If they disagree about any matter, they are jointly to inform the Nuncios of His Holiness in France and Flanders, or the Illustrious Protectors here, and to await the reply and orders which will be given them, and to execute these promptly, without ill-feeling and in true religious charity.

They are to remember the obligation they are under of making known to the Holy Office all those English whom they know to be heretics, or to hold communication with heretics in England or elsewhere to the prejudice of the Catholic religion: and this all the more readily as they know the secrecy accustomed to be observed by the Sacred Congregation.

<sup>1</sup>This italicised clause, underlined in the MS., D. Anselm Beech wished to have deleted. See below.

From the observance or non-observance of these Rules His Holiness will consider what ought to be done as to the revocation or confirmation of the new convent erected by the Benedictine fathers at Douai, or the translation (elsewhere) of the College (*ò translatione del Colleggio*).

His Holiness commands the said fathers of St Benedict and fathers of the Society that they observe the above Rules and orders under pain of disobedience and His displeasure: failing this, in addition to the aforesaid penalties His Holiness will deny them the faculty of sending their subjects any more into England, and will recall those of them who have already been sent.

L. CARDINALIS BLANCHETTUS.

A. CARDINALIS MONTALTUS, Ordinis Sancti  
Benedicti Protector.

It was nearly two months before the Rules were delivered to the contending parties. "These Rules," writes D. Anselm Beech to Cardinal Borromeo on 28th March 1609, "our Holy Father delivered to us personally on the 30th of January. I have delayed to send them hitherto, because I hoped that I might obtain the deletion of certain words, those namely which I have underlined, lest the heretics seeing them should maliciously interpret them to the prejudice of the Catholics; or lest any seditious Catholics, under pretext of benefit to souls, should make them an occasion or excuse for starting new perilous and odious enterprises."<sup>1</sup> The underlined passage to which he refers is plainly that which appears in italics in the printed edition; and so it is evident that the Milan MS. is none other than the copy which D. Anselm sent to Cardinal Borromeo.<sup>2</sup>

Don Anselmo was not alone in desiring some alteration in the Rules. Writing to Cardinal de Givry (now at

<sup>1</sup> State Papers from Milan, vol. I, p. 646.

<sup>2</sup> In his *Dates and Documents*, p. 43, Dom Connolly, not having seen at that time the Italian text printed in the *E.H.R.*, suggested that one of the passages marked for deletion was the clause forbidding those who had fought the cause in Rome to return to England; he now tells me that he realises this was a mistake: though D. Anselm does complain of that clause in writing to Card. de Givry on 2nd March 1609.

Paris) on 27th April 1609, he says that Cardinal Bianchetti, at the request of the Jesuit Fathers, who were not pleased with the Rules, was urging the Pope to insert a clause forbidding the Benedictines *under pain of excommunication* to invite seminarists to join their Order. The Benedictines opposed this through their Protector Cardinal Montalto, and the Pope told the latter that he did not wish any change made in the Rules that he had given. He then passed on the Benedictine memorial to the Holy Office, from which D. Anselm had not yet had an answer.<sup>1</sup> However, writing again to the same Cardinal on 12th July following, he tells of the result. The Jesuits, seeing that they were threatened with excommunication for *dissuading* students from entering the Benedictine Order, while no such penalty was laid on the monks for *inviting* students to join them, asked that this omission should be supplied. But the cases were clearly not parallel; and so, says D. Anselm, the Pope, "in order that we should be on equal terms in this matter, i.e. in that of incurring excommunication, decreed that such excommunication should follow either if they (the Jesuits) *deterred* the alumni of their seminaries from joining us, or we *deterred them from joining the Society*. After which sentence received I have not heard that the Fathers have taken any new steps."<sup>2</sup> The additional clause in question was issued separately, and is dated 23rd April 1609. It is given thus in Dodd-Tierney IV, p. ccxviii.<sup>3</sup>

Coram pontifice, in congregatione S. R. Inquisitionis decretum est, pro parte benedictinorum Anglorum (contra quos postulerunt patres jesuitae ferri sententiam excommunicationis, si monachi dicti hortarentur alumnos seminariorum ipsorum patrum jesuitarum ingredi ordinem sancti Benedicti), ut, sicut patribus jesuitis sub poena excommunicationis prohibitum fuit, ne dis-

<sup>1</sup> *Rev. Bénédictine*, October 1930, p. 364.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Taken from the MS. *Collections* (I, 75) of Weldon, who had it from Bishop Ellis.

suadeant alumnis seminariorum suorum ingredi ordinem sancti Benedicti, aut aliam religionem approbatam, ita sub eadem poena excommunicationis prohibeatur monachis benedictinis ne dissuadeant eisdem alumnis ingredi religionem jesuitarum, aut aliam approbatam ; ac mandavit super hoc servari aequalitatem. April 23, 1609.

As already observed, the Latin version of the Rules printed by Dom Bede Camm from a paper in the Westminster Archives shows some curious variations from the authentic Italian translated above. The chief of these are : (1) the second and third paragraphs are run together, and the excommunication appears to be incurred for breach of the earlier rules of 1600, not for deterring students from becoming monks ; (2) after "The Benedictine fathers" in the fourth paragraph are inserted the words "*et alii Religiosi sub iisdem poenis et censuris*" ; (3) in the last paragraph but one the Latin has "*circa revocationem, confirmationem, aut translationem novi Conventus a Patribus Benedictinis Duaci erecti*" ; whereas the Italian has, for the last clause, "or the translation of the College," i.e., without doubt, of the English College at Douai ; (4) the Latin has the signatures of Cardinals Bianchetti and Farnese, who both stood for the Jesuit side in the controversy, and of two secretaries ; while the Italian has the representative signatures of Cardinals Bianchetti and Montalto, the latter being the Protector of the Benedictines. Are we then to suppose that the Latin is a later, "doctored" version of the Rules ? That seems very unlikely. More probably it represents a contemporary suggestion for a revision, approved by the two Cardinals who sign it, and presented to the Holy Office not long after 30th January 1609, the date on which the Rules were first handed to the parties. It embodies the chief point of change which, as we have seen, was being petitioned for through Cardinal Bianchetti ; and it removes what must have seemed the monstrous sug-

gestion that the English College at Douai might need to be "translated" to some other locality. That suggestion could never have been seriously meant, but it helped to hold the balance, *servare aequalitatem*, and to indicate strict impartiality.

## V.

The *Regulae* appear to have been sent to the Nuncio at Brussels some time before they were communicated to the litigants in Rome, for in a Relation concerning England sent to Cardinal Borghese on 31st January he seems clearly to refer to them. Having stated the nature of the suspicions which had been entertained about the English monks,<sup>1</sup> he says: "On account of these suspicions the Seminary (at Douai) opposed the foundation of the Benedictines, and other contentions arose on all sides. But it being understood at length that the foundation of the Benedictines at Douai was directed to a good end, *and certain articles of concord having been framed by His Holiness* to be inviolably observed by the parties, feelings have been soothed and the differences are in effect almost extinguished."<sup>2</sup>

In the Relation just quoted the Nuncio attributes most of the mischief to the craft of the English government, who wished to sow discord among the Catholics abroad and damage the seminaries. But his private diagnosis of the trouble was somewhat different. On 10th January—apparently before he had heard of the *Regulae*—he wrote two letters to Cardinal Bianchetti, who was in charge of the case at Rome. The one was an open or official report, the other a more confidential communication to be used at the Cardinal's discretion. The first has been printed by Dr Guilday,<sup>3</sup> the second will be found in the Appendix to this article.<sup>4</sup> We have already

<sup>1</sup> See Downside Review, Vol. LII, p. 110.

<sup>2</sup> Appendix, no. XX.

<sup>3</sup> Op. cit. p. 439. See also *Dates and Documents*, p. 29.

<sup>4</sup> No. XIX.

(p. 295) given a summary of the part of this second letter which speaks of the two pictures of Blessed George Gervase. Having told that story the Nuncio continues :

“ What pains me is to see that the Jesuit Fathers have a share in these quarrels ; and one may wonder whether this does not arise from their unwillingness that anyone should have to do with the affairs of the Catholics of England who does not receive (his credentials) from them. That was a very useful step which was taken by the prudence of His Holiness at the recent general congregation of the said Fathers in Rome, viz., that they should be recalled to the ancient institutions of the Order, and that temporal affairs should be left aside and attention devoted to the principal end, which is the good of souls and the preservation and promotion of the Catholic faith. This was told me actually by the Provincial of the Jesuits in Flanders on his return from Italy. . . . I thought it well to mention these matters to your Illustrious Lordship separately, as it seemed unnecessary to insert them in the other letter. Should you think it well, however, to communicate them privately to His Holiness, I leave that to your most prudent judgment. With regard to the aforesaid quarrels, as I intend with God’s help to make a visitation of all these provinces in the spring, I propose in particular to betake myself to Douai, where I shall try to procure more reliable information about everything on the spot. Hence, in case His Holiness should have in mind to make any change in the situation, perhaps he could delay such action for the present.”

On 28th May 1609 Bentivoglio sent two letters to the Cardinal Secretary, dated from Arras whither he had come the day before immediately after carrying out his visitation at Douai. These letters, which describe the visitation, have both been translated by Dom Benedict Mackey in the *Douai Magazine* (vol. VII, pp. 118–122), and



therefore are not included in the Appendix to this article.<sup>1</sup> The first of the two speaks of his action in regard to "the differences existing between the English Seminary and the Benedictine Fathers of that town," to compose which was the chief object of his visit. "I had already had information from Cardinal Bianchetti of certain regulations laid down by order of His Holiness as to the *modus vivendi* between the aforesaid Benedictines and seminarists; and my earnest exhortations were directed to inducing the two parties to observe these rules and to conform to their tenor, not only as regards exterior acts but also interiorly, by putting away all causes of their ancient dislikes and differences. In a word I treated with them all as earnestly and as effectually as I could, particularly with the President of the Seminary and the Vicar of the Benedictines whose Prior was absent. And because, as your Lordship knows, the Benedictines, and others also, suspected that the seminarists were instigated by the Jesuit Fathers,<sup>2</sup> though this on grounds which were not found to be correct, I took occasion to exhort the Father Rector of the Jesuit College in that town not to interfere between the parties in any way which could cause new dissensions, but rather to adopt the rôle of mediator<sup>3</sup> in order the better to preserve union and concord."

In the meantime the Archduke appears to have had, like the Nuncio, if not through the Nuncio, an early intimation of the *Regulae* sanctioned by the Pope on

<sup>1</sup> The originals are in the Fondo Borghese, Serie II, vol. 98, foll. 118 and 119.

<sup>2</sup> Compare the words written from Rome by Thomas Fitzherbert to Dr Worthington, 6th Sept. 1608: "They [the Benedictine monks] object against you, in their own defence, that you are altogether ruled in this matter by father Parsons, and the Jesuits, and that this your demand for their remove from Douay proceedeth rather from them, than from you." Dodd, *Church History*, II, p. 492: not reproduced by Tierney.

<sup>3</sup> "ma più tosto a pigliar la persona di mezzo": Dom Mackey, whose translation is otherwise followed above, renders here "but rather to withdraw himself from the affair."

10th December 1608; for on 23rd February following Fr Bradshaw wrote to Cardinal de Givry that His Highness had recently given his consent for the new monastery which Abbot Caverel was to build for the monks at Douai: "Recently (*nuper*) also here in Belgium, our Right Rev. General [of the Spanish Benedictine Congregation] having supplicated His Highness and used the influence of certain persons of high position among the Spaniards, we have obtained of the Serene Archduke licence to found a monastery in Douai, and we are now looking for a site" (*et jam fundum quaerimus*).<sup>1</sup>

It is perhaps to about this period that we should assign the prophecy, or at least the complete fulfilment of the prophecy, of the Venerable Anne of Jesus, a Carmelite nun and trusted disciple of St Teresa, who in January 1607 had founded a house of the Teresian reform at Brussels. The story is told by her biographer, the Cistercian annalist Angel Manrique, whose Spanish life of her, written in 1631, was translated into French in 1639. His informant was one of the chief actors in the affair, Fr Leander (Jones) of St Martin. The English Benedictines desired permission of the Archduke for the foundation of a house of their Order at Douai, but encountered so many oppositions that they had little hope of success. In these straits Frs Bradshaw and Leander had recourse to the Venerable Anne, who told them to have no doubt as to the event, for that in a short time the Archduke would grant their request: "And so it was; for His Highness, after having shown himself *assez difficile*, finally gave them a favourable answer; and at the same time they received letters from Cardinal de Givry assuring them that His Holiness was well content

<sup>1</sup> *Revue Bénédictine*, October 1930, p. 361. Though we need not doubt that the Spanish influence mentioned by Fr Bradshaw had great weight, yet it would seem that the recent decision in Rome had removed a hitherto insuperable obstacle, and that the Archduke could hardly have given his consent before he had heard of the *Regulae*.

that they should found their mission convent at Douai."<sup>1</sup>

## VI.

After the issue of the *Regulae* there appear to have been no further complaints of the conduct of the Benedictines. Dr Worthington refused at first to take the Rules as applying to himself, and it needed an injunction from the Pope to persuade him to do so, as appears from a letter written to him from Rome by Thomas Fitzherbert on 22nd August, 1609.<sup>2</sup> But Fr Persons died in 1610, and on 4th November 1611 the Archpriest Birkhead wrote to More in Rome: "Father White [i.e. Bradshaw] telleth me plainly that the president and he are good friends, and that he is much changed from what he was, and that I may deal with him confidently."<sup>3</sup>

We have but one more inedited document to notice. Two years after his visitation of Douai Bentivoglio, in the course of another journey through those parts, again called on the Benedictines, namely on the 29th or 30th September 1611, as appears from the Third Douay Diary. Writing to Cardinal Borghese on 5th October he gives an account of this visit. "Four years have passed,"

<sup>1</sup> See an article by Dom Hugh Connolly in the *Downside Review* for May 1931. In a footnote on p. 296 he suggests that this incident "belonged to the autumn of 1607." But it is now clear that the Archduke's consent had not been given in January 1608, and probably not before the beginning of 1609. It seems not improbable, however, that the story told by Manrique some 20 years later combines elements that were really distinct, and that de Givry's letter was considerably earlier than the grant of the Archduke's licence. Weldon (*Chron. Notes*, p. 73), who evidently had access to a version of the same story, says that de Givry's letter was sent "*from Rome*," and the account he gives would best fit the situation existing at the end of 1608, when the Archduke, Richardot and the Nuncio were all of the opinion that the monks had better go. Now it can be shown from de Givry's correspondence that he had left Rome by the end of September 1608; and it seems unlikely that the news of the *Regulae* was first received from him, when he was in Paris early in 1609. His letter, referred to by Manrique and Weldon, may well have been written therefore early in 1608, when the blow was expected but did not fall.

<sup>2</sup> Dodd, *Church History*, II, p. 493.

<sup>3</sup> Dodd-Tierney, V, p. 30, note.

he says, "since the English Benedictines entered Douai with the intention of founding a monastery. At first great opposition was made to them, both by the President of the English Seminary in that town and by the Jesuit Fathers, on account of the suspicions which were then entertained, concerning which I have often had occasion to write to your Illustrious Lordship. The said Benedictines have ever continued to live a very exemplary life; and so, the suspicions entertained about them having at last vanished, all occasions of disagreement between them and the persons aforesaid have likewise come to an end. When I was at Douai for the first time two years ago, I visited the place in which they had been received; and having visited it now again, I have found in the said place<sup>1</sup> the beginning of a very noble edifice, which is so far advanced that they are daily expecting to pass into the new building.<sup>2</sup> This monastery is being built at his own charges by the Abbot of St Vedast of the Order of St Benedict in the city of Arras, the richest Abbot of the Order in these parts. By the contributions of the same Abbot the said Benedictines are chiefly maintained, though at the same time they (help to) provide for themselves.<sup>3</sup> They hope that in a couple of years' time the building of the monastery and the church will be finished.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This letter affords one more proof of the existence of "the old house upon St Albins Church-yard" mentioned by Fr Thomas Woodhope (*C.R.S.*, XXXIII, p. 243); and it shows further that the monks must already have been occupying that house in May 1609, on the occasion of the Nuncio's first visit. From the Trinitarian house, far to the S.E., beyond the River Scarpe and near the church of St-Jacques, it would be impossible to see the new buildings of St Gregory's. What has been said by Dom Connolly, on p. 60 of his *Dates and Documents*, may thus be supplemented and in part modified.

<sup>2</sup> They did so on 15th October (Weldon, *M.S. Collections*, I, p. 40).

<sup>3</sup> An allusion, no doubt, to the two or three lectureships in philosophy which they had already secured in Marchiennes College.

<sup>4</sup> The foundation stone of the church was not laid till 26th May 1614: *Dates and Documents*, p. 60, note. By that time the rest of the monastery was finished. ("El día de S. Augustin de Inglaterra se puso la primera piedra de la Iglesia de S. Gregorio, que todo lo demas del collegio esta hecho, y es muy lustroso y grande": letter of Fr Leander to Spain, 10th June 1614—among the Silos Papers).

Their number is ten or twelve, and as it is hoped that this will increase with the commodiousness of their dwelling, it may also be hoped that their mission in England will in time prove very fruitful, and answerable to their good zeal, seeing that they observe the rule of St Benedict after the strictly reformed manner. I exhorted them again with all earnestness to try and improve the good understanding that now exists between them and the other English in Douai ; and, from what I could observe, it seems to me that the best results may be expected from this my renewed exhortation, since it appears that no inconsiderable success has already attended my former efforts. . . . Cambrai, 5 October 1611.”<sup>1</sup>

Here we have reached the end of our matter, and it is time to take leave of the amiable and tactful Nuncio and his Benedictine friends. Fifteen years later, when he was Cardinal Bentivoglio, the English monks gave a lasting testimony of their gratitude for his many kind offices by dedicating to him their great book *Apostolatus Benedictinorum in Anglia* (Douai, 1626). And now the modern Catholic reader, who is privileged to review these past troubles in all serenity and good humour, yet not perhaps without some moving interest, will look for a word of conclusion to this story of domestic difficulties. If we must needs provide one, we would refer to the few lines of advice which the Archpriest Birkhead wrote to Dr Worthington on 17th September 1609 : “ As for the Benedictines, I am sure that the case so standeth. Beweare you : they are wise, religiose and learned men, and well thought of amongst many of us. Methinkes they should be warie of gevinge you cause of just compleint. My poore opinion is that the best waie is to lett God work his will. I trust there wilbe men sufficient in number both for us and them.”<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, no. XXII.

<sup>2</sup> P.R.O. Domestic James I, XXXVI 8.

# APPENDIX OF DOCUMENTS

## X.

Guido Bentivoglio to Cardinal Borghese.  
(13th October 1607)

*Ex Archiv. Vat., Fondo Borghese Serie II, vol. 100, fol. 242.*

Illmo e Rmo Sigre, e Padron mio Colmo.

Si dolsero ancora con me grandemente, come già scrissi a V.S.Illma, i Padri Benedettini di Duaco, e dell' ordine che fu lor dato di partirsi di quel luogo, e de' i Padri Gesuiti, nè io fin qui ho saputo con che consolarli, se non con raccomandarli alli Abbati convicini dell' istesso ordine di S. Benedetto, perchè da loro fussero aiutati anche per trovar stanza altrove, come ho già scritto a V.S.Illma. Esseguirò hora il nuovo ordine che mi viene da lei, sopra l'informarmi donde nasca la renitenza loro nel partire, e del bene, o male che possa nascere, concedendosi loro licenza di fermarsi in Duaco. Vedrò di saper esattamente ancora quel che passa intorno alla dissension loro co' i Gesuiti, e ne darò poi conto a V.S.Illma. E le bacio per fine humilissimamente le mani. Di Brusselles li 13. ottobre 1607.

Di V.S.Illma (etc.) Guido Arcivo di Rhodi.  
Illmo Sigr Cardl Borghese.

## XI.

Cardinal Borghese to Guido Bentivoglio  
(27th October 1607)

*Ex Bibl. Vat., Codex Barber. 5919, fol. 307.*

Li Benedettini fanno qui gran diligenza contro quelli che fanno istanza che siano cacciati dal Duaco, e portano a lor favore molte ragioni, le quali sono anco aiutati da loro Protettori. La mente di Nostro Signore è che si faccia in coteste parti il servitio del Signore Dio, con l'unione che conviene. A V.S. ch' è presente sarà facil cosa l'havere piena e sincera informatione delle qualità loro, e del danno che possono fare fermandosi in Duaco. Me ne dia perciò avviso, et intenda particolarmente quel che pare più espediente a Sua Altezza, trattandone di ciò seriamente, che si darà l'ordine necessario per stabilire il negotio conforme al giusto. Conceda a V.S. il Signore ogni felicità etc.

Di Roma li 27. ottobre 1607.

## XII.

Guido Bentivoglio to Cardinal Borghese.  
(17th November 1607)

*Ex Archiv. Vat., Fondo Borghese Serie II, vol. 100, fol. 293.*

Illmo (etc.).

Il negotio dei Padri Benedettini di Duaco è di tal natura, che non si può trattar se non con molta destrezza, e circospettione, perciò che nella diversità de i particolari ch'abbraccia si può dubitar, ch'alcuni possino far nascere maggiori alterationi, e far crescere maggiormente per conseguenza le discordie, che qui scuoprono. Procuro io di governarmi in ciò per quella via, donde stimo potersi fuggir questi inconvenienti, e mi vado

informando di quel che passa con quella maggior destrezza che sia possibile. Oltre a ciò io aspettavo à punto il ritorno dell' Arciduca, ch'è in conformità di quanto V.S.Illma m'ordina, per saper di che intentione sia S.Aza intorno a questo negotio, et aspettandosi di giorno in giorno spero di chiarirmene in breve. Di tutto darò poi conto a V.S.Illma. E le bacio intanto per fine humilissimamente le mani. Di Brusselles li 17. Novembre 1607.

Di V.S.Illma (etc.).

Guido Arcivo di Rhodi.

Illmo Sigr Cardl Borghese.

### XIII.

The same to the same

(24th November 1607)

*Ex Archiv. Vat., Fondo Borghese, ibidem, fol. 315.*

Illmo (etc.).

Tre lettere di V.S.Illma ho ricevute con l'ordinario di questa settimana, e sono tutte dei 3. del corrente. A questo non ho che risponder altro, se non replicar, che intorno al particolare dei Benedettini di Duaco eseguirò quel c'ho significato con le mie precedenti. . . . (*a few lines on another matter*).

Brusselles li 24. di Novembre 1607.

Di V.S.Illma (etc.).

Guido Arcivo di Rhodi.

Illmo Sigr Cardle Borghese.

### XIV.

The same to the same

(8th December 1607)

*Ex Archiv. Vat., Fondo Borghese, ibidem, fol. 332.*

Illmo (etc.).

Dei Padri Benedettini ho trattato con S.Aza. Dell' oppositioni, che loro son fatte, non ha saputo S.Aza darmi particular pruova, nè altra luce di più di quella ch'io haveva prima. L'opinione però di S.Aza è che mentre non sian separati gli uni da'gli altri, quei del Seminario, et i sudetti Benedettini, non sian mai per cessar le discordie tra loro. E quanto a questa separatione par più ragionevole a S.Aza che debba farsi ritirandosi a qualch' altra parte essi Benedettini, che son venuti di nuovo, e senza haver particular impresa alle mani. Son restato però con S.Aza di maturar meglio co'l Presidente Ricciardotto la resolutione che sarà bene a pigliare. Del tutto darò poi conto di mano in mano a V.S.Illma. E bacio per fine (etc.) Di Brusselles li 8. Decembre 1607. Di VS.Illma (etc.).

Guido Arciveso di Rhodi.

Illmo Sigr Cardl Borghese.

### XV.

The same to the same

(12th January 1608)

*Ex Archiv. Vat., Fondo Borghese Serie II, vol. 115, fol. 12.*

Illmo (etc.).

Il Presidente Ricciardotto d'ordine di S.A. ha poi havuto meco lungo ragionamento sopra il particolare de' Benedettini. Quel medesimo espediente che fu pensato altre volte, e sopra al quale mi venne ordine anche da N.Sre nel principio del mio arrivo quà, parebbe a S.A. che dovesse

## The English Benedictines at Douai 315

nuovamente pigliarsi, e sarebbe, che i Benedettini si levassero di Duaco, e si fermassero in qualch' altro luogo vicino a i loro Abbati che gli hanno sovvenuti sin' hora, presuponendosi che non sia lor per mancarne. Altro rimedio per levar il seme delle cominciate discordie tra essi Benedettini e'l Seminario par che non si possa pigliare. Et io veramente non so concorrer in altro. Se parerà a N.Sre di voler usar questo, e di darmene ordine, io l'eseguirò come più sarà conveniente. E per fine (etc.).

Di Bruxelles li 12. Gennaro 1608. Di V.S.Illma (etc.)

Guido Arcivo di Rhodi.

Illmo Sigr Cardl Borghese.

### XVI.

The same to the same

(24th May 1608)

*Ex Archiv. Vat., Fondo Borghese Serie II, vol. 115, fol. 204.*

Illmo (etc.).

Sono stati da me ultimamente i Padri Benedettini di Duaco, e con l'occasione di quel Giorgio Gervas dell' ordine loro, che'l mese passato fu fatto morir dal Re d'Inghilterra, com' ho avvisato a V.S.Illma, hanno essaggerata grandemente la causa loro, e con molta efficacia hanno procurato di farmi conoscer con l'esempio sodetto, ch'essi vivono qui in Fiandra, come conviene à buoni e fedeli Religiosi, e che la Religion loro ha quel fine, che solo deve havere della conservatione et avanzamento della fede Cattolica, e che per conseguenza si può conoscer quanto sian false l'imputationi, che lor vengon date. Mi hanno pregato ch'io voglia rappresentar tutto questo alla Santità di N.Sre et a V.S.Illma, et havend' io giudicato, che non mi convenisse negar loro quest' officio, ho scritta a quest' effetto la presente lettera, lasciando però alla singolar prudenza di S.Bue e di V.S.Illma il giudicio, e la terminatione delle differenze di questi Padri co'l Seminario Duacense degli Inglesi. E le bacio per fine (etc.). Di Bruxelles li 24. Maggio 1608.

Di V.S.Illma (etc.).

Guido Arcivo di Rhodi.

### XVII.

Cardinal Borghese to Guido Bentivoglio

(14th June 1608)

*Ex Bibl. Vat., Codex Barber. 5919, fol. 385-386.*

In tutto quel ch'io potrò favorirò prontamente li Padri Benedettini di Duaco e di già ho fatto la relatione à Nostro Signore del loro zelo conforme alla testimonianza di V.S., alla quale per fine prego ogni desiderato bene.

Di Roma li 14. Giugno 1608.

### XVIII.

Father Robert Persons to Pope Paul V

(6th July 1608)

*Ex Archiv. Vat., Fondo Borghese Serie IV, vol. 86, fol. 26 (antico), 30 (nuovo).*

(At the end.) M'era scordato di dire a V.Bae, che essendo venute da diverse parti nuovi lamenti, cioè che Douay, Valliodalid, Ingleterra et Fiandra, intorn' alle controversie con li padri Benedettini inglesi, pare necessario



per obviare a maggiore inconveniente, che V.Stà faccia eseguire quello che haveva designato, che alcun Card<sup>le</sup> del Santo officio che possa attendere a esaminare le particolarità pigliasse per ordine di V.Stà l'assunto, et visti poi li mali, et da dove nascono, si metta un rimedio efficace et universale, che abbracci a tutti, et così si finirà ogni cosa insieme, si sono tanti nuovi memoriali al Sigr Card<sup>le</sup> Farnese sopra il nigotio, li quali Sua S. Ill<sup>ma</sup> comunicherà con V. Bne. Io gli dissi la buona mente di V.Stà et la persona che fra l'altre haveva pensato, et gli piaceva assaissime: Iddio ispiri a V.Bne di fare una buona risoluzione in questo nigotio, il quale impedisce assai la pace di quella chiesa afflitta da tutte le bande: et conservi sempre la Beatissima persona di V.Stà per il ben universale di tutta la Christianità: et con questo bacio humilissimamente li Sacri piedi di V.Bne. alli 6. di Luglio 1608.

Di V.Stà humilissimo servo.

R. Personio.

### XIX.

Guido Bentivoglio to Cardinal Bianchetti  
(10th January 1609)

*Ex Bibl. Vat., Codex Barber. 5885, fol. 417.*

Un nigotio importante, al qual mi convenne attendere l'ordinario passato, mi levò la commodità di scrivere a V.S. Ill<sup>ma</sup>, e d'avvisarle quel che havessi potuto raccogliere in materia delle dissentioni, che passano fra il Seminario degl'Inglesi et i Benedettini di Duay. Viene hora la congiunta lettera a quest' effetto.<sup>1</sup> E qui mi pare d'aggiungere a parte a V.S. Ill<sup>ma</sup>, che veramente dubito, che dalla parte del Seminario non si proceda con qualche passione. Tutto il dubbio è principalmente che i Benedettini non habbiano tentato, e non tentino di sviare gl'alunni del Seminario, e di non far nascere discordie tra essi Alunni e chi li governa. Ciò fin qui appresso di me non è stato approvato, riducendo solo li Seminaristi l'accuse de' Benedettini a quella parte che dà luogo alle prove. La dissentione che passa trà l'una parte e l'altra veramente è grandissima, et io ne viddi un particolar segno questi mesi addietro, e fu questo.

Fu fatto morire in Londra l'anno passato del mese d'aprile Giorgio Gervasio per non haver voluto ricevere il giuramento, e fu publicato per religioso di San Benedetto nella sentenza, e negl' avvisi, che se ne sparsero per una lettera, ch'io viddi qui particolarmente, scritta dall' Ambasciator di Spagna, che resiede in Londra, a questo, che resiede in Brusselles. I Benedettini perciò ne fecero imprimere l'immagine con l'habito di San Benedetto, e con l'iscrizione di quanto era seguito. Poco dopo quelli del Seminario fecero imprimere la stessa immagine con l'habito di Seminarista, e pubblicorno insieme in più d'una lingua ch'era Sacerdote del Seminario, e che falsamente era stato creduto religioso di San Benedetto. Di questa ingiuria che tale ripo(r)torono, fecero i Benedettini doglianze grandi appresso di me. E perchè non s'eran dolsuti prima quelli del Seminario

<sup>1</sup> The accompanying official letter, referred to in the text, precedes the present letter in the same volume. It has been printed by Dr. Guilday op. cit. p. 439, from Bibl. Barber. 5880, where also it is followed by this confidential letter. Bentivoglio, not having received from Card. Bianchetti an acknowledgment by 14th March, wrote again on that day to say that he now enclosed duplicates of both his letters of 10th January. Curiously, there are duplicates of the letter of 14th March as well, following the other two, in these Bibl. Barber. vols. 5880 and 5885.

dell'attione de' Benedettini, mi parve dover credere, che la parte ch'haveva fatto le querele havesse qualche giusta cagione di risentirsi, tacendo l'altra. Quel che mi duole è il vedere che i Padri Gesuiti siano a parte di queste discordie, e che si possa dubbitare che ciò nasca dal non voler' essi che habbia luogo negl' interessi de' Cattolici d'Inghilterra chi non lo riceve da loro. Utilissima cosa invero è stata l'haver procurato Nostro Signore con la sua somma prudenza, che nella Congregatione generale di detti Padri tenuta ultimamente in Roma, si riducano le cose agl'istituti antichi dell' Ordine, e si lascino l'interessi temporali da parte, e s'attenda al principal fine del beneficio dell' anime, e della conservatione et avanzamento della fede cattolica. A me ciò riferi l'istesso Provinciale de' Gesuiti di Fiandra nel suo ritorno d'Italia. E si come reputò che questo rimedio fosse molto necessario in ogn'altra parte, cosl'era necessario in ogn'altra parte di (*sic*) queste Provincie, dove ancorchè siano in generale i costumi più semplici, è stata però trovata da me appresso di molti l'opinione la medesima de' detti Padri, cioè che'l culto dell' anime sia essercitato da loro troppo fuori da' suoi confini, e con mire troppo artificiose di commodi temporali.

Ho voluto separatamente stendermi con V.S. Ill<sup>ma</sup> a tutte le cose sudette, parendomi che non fusse necessario d'inserirle nell'altra lettera. Che s'ella però stimarà conveniente il farne consapevole a parte Nostro Signore, al suo prudentissimo giudizio me ne rimetto.

Quanto alle discordie predette, havendo io pensato alla prossima primavera di visitare coll'aiuto del Signore qualcheduna di queste Provincie, ho pensato ancora di trasferirmi particolarmente in Duay. Ivi di presenza procurarò d'havere più fondata notizia del tutto.

Potrebbe perciò Sua Beatitudine, caso che havesse intentione di mutar le cose, sospenderne sino all'ora l'essecutione. Sarà bene intanto però, che non possono odorar le parti questo mio pensiero, acciò che io possa giungere all'improviso su'l fatto, e trovarne, s'io potrò, la verita nuda. E per fine, etc.

Di Brusselles li 10. Gennaro 1609.

## XX.

Guido Bentivoglio to Cardinal Borghese  
(31st January 1609)

*Ex Archiv. Vat., Fondo Borghese Serie I, vol. 190, fol. 41<sup>v</sup>-42 (antico), 46<sup>v</sup>-47 (moderno).*

(*Headed*) Relatione d'Inghilterra fatta da Mgr Bentivoglio Arcivvo di Rhodi Nuntio della Santità di Nostro Signore Papa Paolo V<sup>o</sup> appresso i Serenissimi Principi l'Arciduca Alberto e Donna Isabella Infanta di Spagna, et inviata all' Ill<sup>mo</sup> Sr Cardinal Borghese Nipote di Sua Santità sotto li 31. Gennaro 1609.

All' Ill<sup>mo</sup> Sigt Cardinal Borghese.

..... I Benedettini erano stati presi in sospetto d'haver più adito che non convenisse appresso i Ministri Regii, e per artificio dei medesimi Ministri venivano fomentati contro di loro altri sospetti ancora d'intelligenze più occulte. Fu dubitato perciò da molti, che le istanze fatte questi anni a dietro dai Benedettini di fermarsi in Duai sotto pretesto della commodità degli studii, ed haver più commoda la loro missione in Inghilterra tendessero ad altri fini non ben sinceri. Dubitossi principal-

mente c'havessero a terminar' in danno del Seminario Inglese fondato in quella Università; cioè che i Benedettini fossero per sviar dal detto Seminario nascostamente molti di quelli alunni, e fossero per dissuader loro particolarmente il mettersi fra i Gesuiti con seminar' altre simili discordie dannose. Nè andarono del tutto vuote le fraudi de i nostri avversarii. S'oppose per questi sospetti il Seminario alla fondatione dei Benedettini, e nacquero altre contentioni da tutte le parti, finchè poi conosciutosi che la fondatione dei Benedettini in Duai era indirizzata a buon fine, e formati dalla Santità di Nostro Signore alcuni articoli di concordia da osservarsi inviolabilmente dalle parti, si sono addolciti gli animi, e quasi estinte affatto le differenze. In questi sospetti erano incorsi i Benedettini.

## XXI.

Cardinal Borghese to Guido Bentivoglio  
(20th June 1609)

*Ex Bibl. Vat., Codex Barber. 5919, fol. 486.*

Alla lettera di V.S. delli 28. del passato<sup>1</sup> fo risposta col presente dispaccio. Gioverà l'ufficio da lei fatto con li Benedettini e Seminaristi di Duaco, nè mi posso persuadere altrimenti poichè lei vi ha aggiunto l'autorità di Nostro Signore. . . . Ha sentito gran contento Sua Beatitudine del frutto che si fa nelli Seminarii da lei visitati, e delli honori che ha ricevuti in diverse Città di coteste parti. Conceda a V.S. la Divina Maestà ogni bene.

Roma li 20. Giugno 1609.

## XXII

Guido Bentivoglio to Cardinal Borghese  
(5th October 1611)

*Ex Bibl. Vat., Codex Barber. 6805, fol. 152.*

Illmo (etc.).

Passa hormai il quarto anno, che entrarono in Duai i Benedettini Inglesi, con intentione di fondar' ivi un Monastero. Furono fatte loro da principio grandissime oppositioni, così dal Presidente del Seminario Inglese, ch'è in quella città, come da i Padri Gesuiti medesimi, per quei sospetti, che allora s'hebbbero, e de quali più volte io ho havuto occasione di scriver a V.S. Illma. Hanno i detti Benedettini continovata sempre una vita molto esemplare; onde finalmente essendo svaniti i sospetti che s'eran presi di loro, sono insieme cessate del tutto le occasioni d'ogni disparere, che passava tra di loro e le persone predette.

Quando io fui due anni sono in Duai la prima volta, visitai il luogo, nel quale essi erano stati ricevuti, et havendolo visitato hora di nuovo, ho trovato in detto luogo un principio di fabrica assai nobile, e ridotta a segno tale, che essi di giorno in giorno sono per passare al nuovo edificio. Fabrica questo monastero a sue spese l'Abbate di San Vedasto, ch'è dentro della Città d'Arras, dell' ordine di S. Benedetto, il più ricco di detto ordine, e di tutti gli altri Abbati di queste parti. Con gli aiuti por(ta)ti dal medesimo Abbate principalmente si sono sostentati sin' hora, e tuttavia

<sup>1</sup> Two letters of the Nuncio to Card. Borghese, written from Arras on 28th May, immediately after his visitation of Douai, are translated by Dom Benedict Mackey in the *Douai Magazine* for June, 1902, vol. vii, pp. 118-122. See above, p. 48 and 49 n. 1.

## The English Benedictines at Douai 319

si sostentano i predetti Benedettini; i quali sperano, che tra due altri anni debba esser finito l'edifitio di detto Monastero con la chiesa. Il numero loro è di diece, o dodici. E potendosi sperar che debba crescer con la commodità dell' habitatione, si può anche haver speranza che la lor missione in Inghilterra debba col tempo esser molto fruttuosa, e corrispondente al molto lor zelo, osservando essi massime la regola di San Benedetto con rigorosa riforma.

Io ho ricordato loro con ogni efficacia a procurar di stabilire ogni di meglio la buona intelligenza, c'hora passa tra di loro, e gli altri Inglesi che sono in Duai, e da quel che ho potuto raccogliere, parmi che si possa aspettare pieno frutto da questa mia nuova essortatione, essendosi di già veduti non piccioli effetti delle prime diligenze ch'io usai. E per fine (etc.).

Di Cambrai li 5. d'ottobre 1611. Di V.S. Ill<sup>ma</sup> (etc.).

G. Arcivvo di Rhodi.

It is my pleasant duty to express my thanks to Dom Hugh Connolly whose "Dates and Documents" are such an indispensable guide to all students interested in the History of St Gregory's.

But more than this. I had the benefit of his valuable comments which greatly helped me in compressing the original elaborate study—too long to be printed in the DOWNSIDE REVIEW—into the smaller compass of two articles. He also greatly assisted me in seeing the whole through the press. So that the present writer, whilst rightly claiming to be held to account for whatever errors still remain, whether in matters of detail or historical judgment, feels bound, and is happy, to acknowledge his debt of respectful gratitude for the assistance liberally given.

# THE BENEDICTINE CHAPEL OF THE ROSARY IN LONDON

(circa 1650—1681)

By DOM HUGH CONNOLLY

**I**N annotating a list of English Benedictines of the year 1613, in the Catholic Record Society's volume XXXIII, I had occasion to mention the Chapel of the Rosary established in London about the middle of the seventeenth century by Fr Anselm Crowder (pp. 219—221). For a brief sketch of the career of this able and devout monk the reader may be referred to the passage mentioned. He was professed at Douay in 1611 and had passed to the mission before 1624, probably several years before. There he became Cathedral Prior of Rochester by the Bull *Plantata*, 1633, Provincial of Canterbury in 1653, and Cathedral Prior of Canterbury in 1657; and for a considerable period he acted as procurator in England for the English Dames of Cambray. Most of his missionary life appears to have been spent in London, where he became the friend and close associate of Fr Thomas Vincent Sadler of St Laurence's, Dieulouard, who was nephew to Robert Vincent Sadler, one of the two Cassinese monks aggregated to Westminster by Fr Buckley. Fr Crowder died in London on 5 May 1666, and Fr Sadler at Dieulouard on 19 January 1681. The latter was the author of a 'Catalogue of the English Benedictines since the Schism,' which he showed to Anthony Wood in 1675.<sup>1</sup> This work, no longer extant, but known and used by Weldon, was an enlargement and continuation of Fr Thomas Woodhope's 'Obital Book' (now edited in C.R.S. XXXIII), and it would naturally

<sup>1</sup> See C.R.S., vol. XXXIII, pp. 240—241. The title quoted above is that given to the book by A. Wood; the full title seems to have been 'A Catalogue of the English Benedictine monks who died in England and in their monasteries since the schism.' See p. 323 below.

BX	Fabre 6-30-95
3033	The settling of the
.D7F2	English Benedictines at
	Douai
	1459817
JUN 8 1945	Bindery <i>Source</i>
JUN 29 1945	
	2- 11897

BX 3033  
.D7F2

1459817

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



36 933 749

